

THE CONGREGATIONAL REVIEW.

VOL. VIII.—MAY, 1868.—No. 41.

ARTICLE I.

THE PLACE OF REPENTANCE IN RELIGION AND THEOLOGY.

MALADJUSTMENTS of Christian doctrine have often, in the history of the church, done as much mischief as the teaching of downright error. They are, themselves, forms of error. They rob truth of its symmetry, they destroy the just proportions between its parts, they deprive it of power. It is important to hold and utter the different truths that go to compose the divine system; it is also important to give them their proper relations to each other. Two truths may be each held, and yet so maladjusted in respect to each other, so held out of place, and in relations so untrue and injurious as to have all the effect of error upon men's minds.

Repentance and faith are so set forth in the Scriptures that it is difficult not to recognize them as, taken together, the two great co-ordinate requirements in order to salvation. But in relation to each other they may be readily misplaced, often have been utterly so, and are still very extensively. In this article it is proposed to show what is the proper place of the former in religion and theology.

It is the great, vital, experimental condition of saving or Gospel faith, the condition antecedent, or precedent. It is the condition on which alone faith can be exercised, logically and in the nature of things, yet not of necessity chronologically, though no man can successfully deny that it sometimes chronologically precedes, or that it sometimes occurs at the same moment with the first act of faith. But never afterwards as a first genuine saving repentance. This is our thesis.

The world of modern thought is indebted for the truth now to be maintained, to masters in New England theology. For depth, for spirituality, for method, for clearness, for conclusiveness, these giants have never been surpassed. By many teachers and expounders of scriptural doctrine no distinction has been made between repentance and faith. The professed theologians are at fault as well as the commentators. Some, with a wonderful confusion of thought, assert that these two religious exercises are one and the same thing, only viewed in different aspects. Some assert that they mutually include each other logically and chronologically, or are co-equally conditions of each other. Dr. Archibald Alexander, who did not intensely admire the New England theology, with its methods of clearing up God's truth, and reconciling the mind to it, says of repentance and faith: "As to the precedence of one before the other it is a question as impertinent as whether a whole precedes one of its parts, or is preceded by it." The Presbyterian Confession of Faith, which Dr. Alexander implicitly followed, puts repentance after faith, and yet it so defines them each as to show that faith should have the precedence. The Shorter Catechism also puts faith first; the Larger Catechism does the same once, but in other places reverses the order (Answers to Questions 67 and 153). All three make them both evangelical and saving graces. Dr. Alexander asserts that: "No man can give a sound definition of evangelical repentance which will not include faith," meaning specific faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as an atoning Saviour. But he adds: "If the word repentance be used in a more restricted sense, for godly sorrow for sin and hatred of it, it must be preceded by a true faith, for seeing in a rational mind goes before feeling." The reasoning discloses his exclusion of will

from each and from conversion as a whole, making them passive experiences, in which an essential part of the mind takes no part, instead of regarding them as acts of the whole mind ; intellect, sensibility and will, all acting, and acting together. All three are thus represented as stopping short of entire conversion, for the will of the sinner must be converted as well as his intellect and his feeling.¹ Dr. Alexander made, after all, just enough distinction between repentance and faith to miss the truth and give the precedence to the wrong one.² Dr. Plumer writing later,³ denies that they are analytically distinct, and quotes the saying, "the true tears of repentance flow from the eye of faith." These two writers, it is supposed, fairly represent Old School Presbyterianism.⁴

President Edwards at first treats repentance and faith as necessarily implying each other, and as being the two several parts of Gospel conversion ; the one being the turning from sin, the other the turning to God. In his discourse on justification by faith alone, he meets this objection to his doctrine, viz., that repentance is the special condition of the remission of sins, by asserting that justifying faith is the whole of conversion and includes repentance. "There is something in faith, or closing with Christ," he says, "that respects sin, and that is evangelical repentance. [It] is that very principle or operation of the mind

¹ A Congregational professor of theology, not of New England, agrees apparently with Dr. A. when he says: "Repentance is a state of mind that implies the fullest confidence in all the promises and threatenings of God, and in the atonement and grace of Christ." He regards both repentance and faith, however, as purely and entirely acts of will; all phenomena of intellect and sensibility in his view being "purely passive states of mind," and the will the only active faculty. His philosophy is utterly contradictory to Dr. Alexander's.

² The citations are from his Brief Compend of Bible Truth.

³ Vital Godliness. p. 228.

⁴ Dr. Plumer holds that holy love always co-exists with faith and repentance. Dr. Chalmers (Notes on Hill) excludes the moral affections, as simple consequences, from faith, "which is an act of the understanding." Dr. A. A. Hodge, in his acute and able work on the Atonement, seems to indicate a more logical view, as he does of some other points. He says, p. 319: "We believe that God could have changed man's subjective moral condition by the direct action of his Holy Spirit upon the human soul, without the objective exhibition of his love by means of such a sacrifice as that made in the person of his Son." Such a change could not begin with faith. And what he says elsewhere of the permanent office of the law, indicates his holding that it does not, even under the Atonement, with all its moral power.

itself that is called faith, *so far as it is conversant about sin.*"¹ But he is obliged, after thus stretching the signification of the one to include the other (as had been the theological custom), so that he could say justified by faith alone, meaning, by faith and repentance together, to return to Scriptural distinctions, after all and add :

"These things do not necessarily suppose that repentance and faith are words of just the same signification, for it is *only so much* in justifying faith as respects the evil to be delivered from by the Saviour, that is called repentance" (*i. e.*, that *is*, repentance, properly so called), "and besides, repentance and faith, take them only in their general nature, are entirely distinct."

It would seem, then, to be the method of common sense, unaffected by artificial theology, to keep them distinct. He goes on to admit that repentance for the remission of sins is as much a part of the justifying act as faith, and again he declares that "repentance in its more general, abstracted nature, is *only* a sorrow for sin and forsaking of it." By general nature he means its own proper nature as such, in itself considered, or analytically considered, apart from its relations to anything else associated with it, which is precisely what we mean when we call it the condition precedent of faith. Among President Edwards's Theological Questions are the following: "55. What is true repentance, and how distinguished from legal? 56. What is true faith?" It is to be regretted that he did not answer these questions analytically and distinctively. The younger Edwards does not include the subject of repentance among those subjects on which his father made "improvements in theology." He entitles one of his own sermons in proof of the necessity of

¹ Writers who deny the proper office of faith as related to a vicarious atonement run the two together in the same way, resolving the whole of regeneration into repentance. "The call to believe in Christ is only, in other words, a call to repentance, because believing on Christ, receiving Christ, coming to Christ, and all such forms of expression denote submitting the mind to Christ, and leading that new life which his religion requires; and this is but another way of describing repentance." Sheldon, *Sin and Redemption*, p. 216. So Dr. Bushnell, *Vicarious Sacrifice*, p. 434: "The real faith is this, the trusting of one's self over, sinner to Saviour, to be in him and new characterized by him." This is the new "relation of faith to justification." So Dr. John Young's *Life and Light of Men*. So, with opposite views of atonement, Nitzsch, *Chr. Doc. Ed. Transl.*, 299; Storr and Platt, 2: 369.

an atonement, "Mere repentance no ground of pardon;" meaning, repentance alone, without an atonement, which is distinct from it, and of course without faith, or acceptance of an atonement, which also is distinct. In his short essay Concerning the warrant of the sinner to believe in Christ, in reply to Abraham Booth, he observes:

"If by *believing in Christ*, Mr. Booth means a persuasion or confidence of any person, that Christ is *his* Saviour, that *his* sins are forgiven for Christ's sake; and that *he* shall through Christ be saved; Mr. Booth must not expect that it will be granted, that any unregenerate sinner (*i. e.*, impenitent) has a warrant to believe this."

In his sermon on Faith and a Good Conscience, he controverts the notion that faith is at all the cause of love to God or Christ, or of a saving compliance with the Gospel, and shows that faith is itself caused by a change of heart, which first takes place, "and then the man is prepared for the exercise of faith as well as other graces."

Dr. Bellamy, in his Treatise on the Law our Schoolmaster, mentions seventeen things as implied in, or necessary in order to, faith, such as, hearty approbation of the law, a sense of the infinite evil of sin, and true repentance. "Implied in" is not equivalent here to included in, but to pre-requisite for, in the reason and nature of things.

"Is it fit a sinner should be pardoned by God the Lawgiver," he asks, "before he sees and feels the law is just by which he stands condemned; so as to cease complaining; yea, so as actually to approve, justify, and acquiesce in it? Or *can* a sinner till then see any proper and rational ground for an atonement; or discern his need of Christ?"

In his essay on the Nature and Glory of the Gospel, Bellamy shows progress in the development of doctrine by maintaining that repentance is before forgiveness; that we "can not believe the Gospel to be true with all the heart without repentance;" that faith, which confessedly is before forgiveness, implies repentance in its own nature, and no man will ever be forgiven on the ground of his faith, till first he is brought to genuine repentance. So Hopkins taught that repentance is "implied in and

antecedent to saving faith," fortifying the distinctions now established in New England theology still further. Though he uses the word included as well as implied, he explains that the two are *so* implied in each other, and *so far* connected, that one is not without the other. Repentance as something foregoing, he maintains, comes into the nature of faith, *i. e.*, gives character to it, and has a co-existence with it, and is not properly a fruit or effect of it. Quoting Paul's testimony of what he had preached to Jews and Greeks, as distinguishing the two from each other, he says, as repentance toward God is put first, so it takes place in the mind first in the order of nature, and precedes faith in Christ. He adds:

"To prevent mistakes, that repentance toward God, which in the order of nature is antecedent to faith, implies faith in God, or a real belief of his being and glorious perfection." "This faith is, in the order of nature, antecedent to faith in Jesus Christ." "And even this faith implies repentance, for an impenitent heart is not capable of it, and does not discern and believe the existence and character of God, as the renewed, penitent heart does."

And he closes the matter by saying that:

"Though these distinctions may be made, and are founded in the nature of things and the connection of revealed truth, and proper and necessary in order more clearly to understand the subject, yet a person may doubtless be a true believer in Jesus Christ and not distinguish his views and exercises so as to perceive, experimentally, which is prior to the other, and in what particular order they have taken place in his mind, and may entertain notions, in theory, on this point which are really contrary to the truth of things, which may have been imbibed by education and wrong instruction."

We have perhaps lingered too long among the theologians. The histories of doctrine give little help in fixing the place of repentance, indeed hardly recognize its place among doctrines at all. Many other truths less essential have prominence in all the treatises—Neander, Hagenbach, Shedd,—this has not. There was advancing clearness of distinction in the New England view up to the time when the relations of repentance to faith, as the indispensable pre-requisite, were brought out convincingly and in strong relief. Is it there still? Or has the cry, "Give us the

Gospel," driven into obscurity and forgetfulness that on which all the real efficacy of the Gospel depends? Let us turn to God's own view of the place of repentance as given in the Bible.

One of the strongest and clearest declarations was that of our Saviour at the close of the parable of the two sons. It was uttered, two days before he suffered, to the chief priests, elders and scribes at the temple, just after they had demanded his authority for doing what he did. He silenced them by demanding the authority for John's ministry, and followed it up by a parable disclosing that the cause for their rejecting John's ministry was their impenitence, opening the way to the tacit inference that this was also the reason of their rejecting his.

The application has unusual closeness and gripping, crushing force, because it is founded on their own admissions. The son who made excellent professions, but did not go into the vineyard to work, they conceded did not do the will of his father. And this was their case. The son who answered roughly, but afterward repented and went, they confessed was the better. The publicans and harlots then, said our Lord, go into the kingdom of God before *you*. For John came unto you in the way of righteousness and ye believed him not, but the publicans and the harlots believed him; and ye, when ye had seen (all this) repented not afterward *that ye might* believe him. The point made is, clear as light, that they *could* not believe, because they would not repent. The difficulty was nowise theoretical, but purely practical. All the truth John's mission conveyed was powerless to produce faith, because there stood in the way a tenacious attachment to their sins. On that point the Pharisee proved more tenacious—as another parable teaches that he did in respect to a proud, self-righteous estimate of himself—than the publican. All the wondrous evidences of John's power over men's hearts were unavailing to produce faith until repentance should have made faith possible. He who knew what was in man here points out with infallible accuracy the law of mind, which our greatest and wisest masters in New England theology have expounded as matter of experience and analysis.

The believing of the publicans and harlots is here placed in

immediate connection with their entering the kingdom of God ; not implying that they entered or believed without repentance, but necessarily the reverse, that they first repented, as we know they did. That which came *last* in their experience is mentioned in closest connection with the result, of course. The very message of John to these sinners was, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. The part which they believed was the latter. The exhortation, Repent, they obeyed, and the only way to obey this was, not to believe it, but to repent. It conveyed and urged a divine command. Commands are not addressed to faith, but to conscience. They contain, not truth to be believed, but duties to be done. Having done this thing, these sinners were prepared, were able—speaking philosophically—as not before, to believe in the coming kingdom. The only way to believe the second part of John's message was to obey the first, understanding this kingdom to be that of Christ, repenting was the prior thing necessary to entering it, believing on him the secondary. Understanding it to be a kingdom of righteousness, to repent was the first and indispensable thing. And if so for a Pharisee, then for a publican or a harlot—for all alike. Need enough of it both could see in the light of the old moral law ; right to the very consciousness of this need John spake, immediately, incisively, convincingly ; and when he gave, as a new reason for repenting, the kingdom of heaven is at hand, he meant that, over and above all the necessity for repentance in their manifest moral state, it so goes before faith that the kingdom of Christ which was presently to make such demands on a Jew's faith, be he publican or Pharisee, could not be received unless there was foregone repentance. The Saviour was to arise when John had first preached the baptism of repentance, as Paul puts it at Antioch, understanding the logic of the matter just as his Master had declared it. The prediction of John had been that he should turn many to the Lord their God, coming before the Messiah in the spirit and power of the old prophetic preacher of repentance, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord ; and so it was. This message was single and unchanging, everywhere and always insisting that those only could believe who had repented. All which our Saviour rivetted

upon the Pharisees by pointing out that their failure to believe John proved it, proved that the very sinfulness which necessitated repentance kept them from repenting, and so prevented faith in John's announcement of his kingdom.

It will hardly be suggested here that the righteousness and repentance John preached were in relation to the ceremonial law. The chief priests, scribes and elders had enough of that sort of righteousness. They were models of ceremonialism, the chief ritualists of the nation. To that kind of repentance they needed not to be exhorted. John's enlargement upon his great theme,—Bring forth fruits meet for repentance; the axe is laid unto the root of the trees; every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is (to be) hewn down and cast into the fire,—implied that these tall trees of formalism did not bring forth the good fruits of repentance, and that ceremonialism could not mend the matter. Nor had his baptism any ceremonial significance. Luke calls it the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, the least meaning of which must be not baptism as ground of forgiveness, but as symbolizing the necessity of repentance, or change of heart, in order to forgiveness.¹ So when they went to him at the Jordan they were baptized, confessing their sins, *i. e.*, confessing their need of such a change of heart. Paul says that John baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him who should come after. There has been much labor to distinguish between this repentance and evangelical repentance, also between John's baptism and Gospel or Christian baptism, which seems labor misplaced and lost. The only repentance John was ever authorized to preach, or anybody else, was change of heart in respect to right and wrong toward God; and Christ's Gospel requires the same, though it uses more motives than John did. And if one's Johannean baptism did not signify the necessity of repentance of unbelief along with other sins he might well be

¹ It is to be feared that this fundamental, symbolic meaning of the rite has extensively slipped out of the thoughts of Christians of all denominations, leaving the whole "doctrine of baptisms" superficial, vague, and unsatisfactory. The proper mode of restoring meaning and substance to it was pointed out in this Review, No. XXXIV. (Oct. 1866) pp. 598-607.

baptized over again, as some were ; or if the preaching that accompanied it did not declare the need of being converted to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, not so much as even recognizing the Holy Ghost at all. But baptism after Christ came still meant the absolute necessity of spiritual cleansing by such a radical change of heart toward the Godhead, as its primary, deepest and most vital meaning, *whatever other meanings it may have gained*. John baptized, as he said, with water only, unto, or pointing to repentance ; but Jesus, baptizing not the body, or with water,—leaving the mere physical symbol to his disciples,—baptized the soul with the thing symbolized, with the regenerating, renewing Spirit, the Holy Ghost,—actually begetting that change of heart, so, thoroughly purging his floor, garnering the wheat and sweeping away the impenitent chaff with unquenchable fire. In all which repentance is manifestly regarded as the one indispensable preparative for the spiritual receiving of Christ, or Gospel faith, and impenitence as the parent of unbelief.

Let us now see if repentance still bears for us the same relation to faith. As Christ himself needed a forerunner, let us see if faith in him needs one still. It is convincing to notice how he enjoined repentance as the first and foremost thing, antecedent to every thing else saving, just as John did. He took up the echo of the Baptist's preaching and mightily prolonged it. What Nicodemus heard in his first private teaching was : Ye must be born again ! The description of his first public preaching is : From that time Jesus began to preach the Gospel of the kingdom of God, and to say, Repent ; the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand. Repent ye, *and* believe the Gospel : the believing being something additional, something to follow the other in the order of nature, even though both took place at the same time. And the burden of the Sermon on the Mount was : Make to yourself another heart from that you have ; Enter ye in at the strait gate of conversion,—all addressed, not to the believing faculties, but to conscience, sense of responsibility, power of moral and spiritual decision. Even the encouraging assurances given do not refer to the way of pardon by atonement, which was a much later truth in his preaching ;

but to the gift of the Holy Ghost, the producing cause first of repentance, then of faith. And of his whole ministry how large a part was occupied with the indispensableness of a new heart and a new moral purpose touching sin, as always the very initial with every one of the alphabet of salvation. He came to call sinners to repentance, he said of himself, and none received him as Messiah save those prepared therefor by the new birth. They that were born of God believed. Believing that Jesus is the Christ is named as proof of having been born of God. The faith indicates the change of heart. His office of healing was for those who had been broken in heart, only those. He promised comfort to those so changed in character as to be spiritual mourners.

The apostles began at the same point, that men should repent; and their Lord's commission to them was that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations. We have two addresses of Peter after his Lord's atoning death, and this was the burden of them: Repent, and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins: Repent, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out. Twice Paul gives account of his own preaching, and repentance toward God was the first article of it, whether he addressed Jews or Greeks. The account given of their departed Master by the apostles to the Sanhedrim was, that he was exalted as a Prince and a Saviour to give repentance to Israel and so forgiveness. This was the aspect in which they reported him; and when they heard that his kingdom had extended beyond Israel, it was in this form the tidings came, that God also to the Gentiles had granted repentance unto life. Paul wrote to Gentiles at Rome that the goodness of God *leadeth* to repentance, not intending to deny or ignore that it afterwards leads also to confidence, trust, faith, but to impress them that it leads to repentance first, and to those through this. Once the gift of repentance to the acknowledging of the truth is mentioned as the condition of receiving the truth. Those who put away a good conscience such as repentance gives are said concerning faith, in consequence, to have made shipwreck. And when the experience of repentance is set in contrast with a perishing condi-

tion of soul and in connection with life and salvation, just as faith often is (as faith also is made the condition of pardon just as repentance is), it is plain that they are both necessary to forgiveness and eternal well-being, but not in the same way, or as being the same thing at all. The saving of the soul depends on *two* things, and one comes before, and the other after, as their several objects require; repentance, antecedent, yet not enough by itself—for turning from sin does not alone entitle to forgiveness for sin even when past,—and faith consequent, for the atonement, which is the subject of faith, is the indispensable ground of forgiveness to the repentant sinner; repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.

Now that this must be so, in the reason and nature of things, is transparently clear. Is it to be thought of that God would provide a salvation from the consequences of sin available to man before sin is given up? Infinitely as he loves to be trusted, that impenitent men should trust him for blessings he can not possibly bestow, save on the penitent, is something he can not away with. That faith in his Son which he requires is a holy faith, and this makes it necessary that the soul should first go over to holiness from sin. As it is good for nothing if works do not follow it, so it is if repentance does not precede it. It is dead being alone. It is no ground of pardon. It has no holiness in itself. Its validity and vitality comes from a moral change elsewhere than in the believing faculties. As a new exercise of the soul it is, without repentance, simply putting confidence in God in respect to one's well-being because of the love and work of Christ, our well-being remaining the supreme object of regard. It is utterly selfish. A sinner's trust in everybody and in everything—God included—is selfish, until selfishness is dethroned by a change of mind. And he uses the motives of the Gospel, the offers of eternal blessedness and well-being, in the same selfish way as everything else. Not a whit more readily does he employ the terrors of the law in the spirit of dominating private interest, than he does the Cross of Christ. He has no right to do so, for he has no right to trust a forgiving God at all, or to put faith in his Son who died for his soul, until he can exercise disinterested love. But there is such

a thing as doing it. We solemnly fear that a good deal of what passes for Gospel faith is only and simply selfish trust. The clamor for the Gospel instead of the law in our congregations has been largely a selfish clamor. Preachers have defeated the Gospel itself by yielding to it. They have confirmed erroneous views and practice. A Gospel that offers all good, emasculated of its law-element which disallows and fearfully sentences the supreme desire of good, any faithless and perverse generation might welcome. The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul. No conversion without it. None save a conversion to it. The notion that the holding up of future punishment, makes ignoble, mercenary, cowering Christians, and that nothing but the love of Christ must be proclaimed to produce generous, disinterested, noble-spirited saints is transparently futile. There are multitudes in our churches who show the fruits of this superficial, perverted, and thoroughly unevangelical course; they came in without any surrender of selfishness; their repentance was only sorrow that they had neglected their own permanent interests so long; their faith was only confidence that God would take care of their happiness; they are Christians, so to speak, on thoroughly selfish principles, supposing that gain is godliness, having never experienced any change as to the ultimate end for which they live. It is not any one particular view of the atonement, and of Christ, that has been so abused. Though it may seem more difficult to preach a limited atonement to men and avoid selfish impressions, it is perfectly easy in preaching a general atonement to make them and confirm men in sin under them. The theory of an arbitrary personal election will fall in with these impressions and deepen them. But that notion of a free salvation which denies divine decrees, or even foreknowledge, is handled so as to beget them as well. The phenomena of a selfish faith are so manifest in the churches of all denominations, and so disastrous; the inconsistencies and untrustworthiness of many professors of religion are so directly traceable to it, and it is so well known that the purpose and habit of self-pleasing are doubly difficult of dislodgement from a human soul after the hope of heaven has been entertained, that we emphasize here the practical im-

portance of this view of the relations of repentance. It is an illustration of the incalculable moment of radical distinctions in theology to the interests of religion. The only way to make faith selfish is to exercise it before repentance. It is then but one step above the belief of the devils, and of the same kind; for it is as truly bad to believe and hope, not loving the while the God believed in, as to believe and fear, though it is not so painful.

But is there not a selfish repentance? a forsaking of sin from supreme regard to our personal gain thereby? a change of mind from selfishness, the motive of which is selfish? The question answers itself. What is meant by a selfish repentance is sorrow of feeling in view of the ruin coming from sin, without action of will in respect to it, and this is no change of mind. Old writers speak of a legal repentance in distinction from evangelical. All true repentance is legal, *i. e.*, in view of God's law against which sin is always committed. If not, it is nothing. The old writers meant a selfish attempt to forsake sin out of supreme regard to consequences, and this may happen under the name of evangelical as well as under the name of legal; *i. e.*, the hope of heaven through Christ may lead to it as well as the fear of hell. There is a proper use of the offer of salvation in repentance, to keep one from false views of God, and from despair; but if it begets hope before selfishness yields, it is an improper and fatal use of it. There is no evangelical repentance that is not the simple giving up of our well-being as supreme, because it is right, and according to the eternal spiritual law as reënforced and illustrated in the Gospel; giving it up for God's sake, and not, by a deceptive involution of motive, for our own, after all, for in this way it can not be given up. He that saveth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life the same shall save it. The law is less likely to fail of the true effect, working on naked conscience with the power the Holy Ghost gives it, than a hope of escape, or a feeling of ease in respect to the soul's future, moving self-love. The law is our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ.

We can not leave the subject without touching some points that grow out of the discussion of it.

1. If either repentance or faith can ever be properly said to include the other, it must be the latter alone. Not both, as some unphilosophically and unscripturally say. That is not possible. There is a sense in which that which must go before something else may be loosely and inaccurately said to be included in that which comes after. That which is conditioned on an antecedent may be regarded in some sort as embracing its condition. It would be very vapid and idle to say that our Saviour meant in Matt. xxi. 32, that the included thing could take place only in the inclusive; he plainly meant that the Pharisees could not believe John because repentance is not included in faith, but prior to it, and the indispensable foundation for it. The prior thing could not possibly include that which follows it; and the latter pre-supposes and takes for granted the former instead of including it. Going to church and hearing the truth do not include each other, nor does the hearing, even, include the going, which is a different act, but simply pre-supposes it as a *sine qua non*.

2. If either can be regarded as synonymous with conversion, it is clear which it must be. Conversion is often used to comprehend both, and everything involved in salvation, even the act of the Spirit. But the Bible is sometimes more analytic than this: *e. g.*, Repent, and be converted; repent, and turn unto the Lord. The turning from sin, which analytically must be first, is here put first; turning to the Lord's service afterwards, *i. e.*, giving him the heart taken from sin. Trusting him for our acquittance from liability to penal wo analytically follows, and is a Christian grace in a sense in which giving up sin can not be. There is a repentance, indeed, which is a Christian grace, coming after believing, *i. e.*, the repentance of a Christian. This may be chiefly produced by Christ's work, for when selfishness is dethroned, gratitude, which before was natural and selfish, becomes spiritual and disinterested. But a first repentance which dethrones selfishness is nearer to the scriptural meaning of conversion than a benevolent or holy faith which follows it.

3. Such errors as misplaced relations of faith, confounding it with repentance, and confounding the subsequent repentance

of a Christian with the primary repentance of a sinner, may naturally enough have much to do with errors touching the atonement itself. If the law-work is dropped out of its proper place it must be occupied by the Gospel. It is but a step from the notion of the Cross alone, as working a moral effect in man, to the notion of the Cross, as working a moral effect alone. Give the law its sphere in bringing to repentance, and what is called the moral view of the atonement is shorn of its power to mislead. What the law could not do God sent his Son to do, and the larger part of that is to readjust the relations to the government of the sinner in whom the moral change is wrought already. This will have moral effects of its own, certainly; but they will follow the effect of the moral law and the Spirit's work through it, and its own effect on the governmental relations of the sinner. Doubtless some exaggerations of the true view of atonement have something to do with biasing men towards the erroneous view; but keep faith to its proper sphere succeeding repentance, and repentance to its proper sphere preceding faith, and the work of the Son and the Spirit are not likely to be confounded.

4. The relation of repentance to unbelief and disbelief here comes out clearly. All men are guilty of the former sin before conversion, some men also of the latter. A Christian after conversion may be guilty of the former: Lord, I believe; help thou my unbelief. This is negative, a lack of faith, betokening a lack of love which occasions it. Disbelief is much more. But both are, in unconverted men, forms of selfishness. Either may be the leading form. They were such with the Jews. They are not with those brought up under Christian privileges; nor is it true at all to say that unbelief is now the parent of all sin. Nor is repentance of unbelief the whole of repentance; though it may be a large part. It is common for those to fall into mistake on this point, who are in confusion of thought as to repentance and faith. "Only believe" is not safe advice to a sinner whose selfishness has not concentrated in rejection of Christ's Messiahship as that of many Jews did. Even to them the first message was rather, Repent! If one truly obeys this, unbelief will go with his other sins. On the other hand,

giving up no one of the particular forms of selfishness—partial in themselves—is giving up selfishness altogether.

5. The ordinances of Christ's house take their proper order in accordance with the order of the truths to which they point as symbols. Because repentance is prior to faith, because the *necessity* of repentance is a prior necessity to that of faith, baptism legitimately and appropriately comes before the Lord's supper. If in the soul the order were reversed, if faith came first, in experience or in necessity, the supper should be administered first. If faith included all of conversion, or unbelief were all of sin, this one ordinance alone would be enough. There is no rule in the New Testament for baptizing first, but the relations of a change of heart to atonement indicate priority. Baptism, indeed, does not imply at all that the subject has repented, or experienced the washing of regeneration, but it indicates the absolute necessity of it, a necessity that should be first confessed, early confessed, confessed touching all in the families of God's people; and the supper indicating that atonement is equally and as absolutely necessary to the forgiveness of the regenerated sinner, comes after it, and after there is a change of heart.

6. The main point to be urged upon the heathen must ever be substantially one and the same. If accepting Christ as an atonement for sin were identical with forsaking the sins of heathenism, or analytically included it, it would be necessary merely to persuade them to believe in him, and their repentance would of course, and of necessity, be therein accomplished. There may be found devout religious men among them, the law-work having gone before the Gospel, the Spirit taking, not the things of Christ, of which they have never heard, but the law written on the heart, and urging it home. In such exceptional cases, the missionary may preach to them "Only believe." Or they may be under conviction of sin, not having yet repented, and need first to be told how to repent. But the great mass of them know not what repentance is, or what to repent of, and the first Gospel message to them should make them feel the absolute necessity of repentance. And a full message the Gospel has on this point. "There is doubtless as great a

number of Scripture texts which represent repentance as necessary to pardon," says Hopkins, "as there is that represent faith as necessary thereto." The Gospel wisely includes the law, and it lays that it may make alive. It tells men of sin before it tells them of a Saviour. It regards them as impenitent sinners, an old designation and more accurate than sinners merely, for this includes Christians, though even this has too much slipped out of our religious language, while the former and stronger designation has in some quarters disappeared entirely. It does not fall into the blunder and confusion of thought of telling men, however impenitent, to come to Jesus to be accepted and have faith, that his love and grace will have the moral effect of renewal upon them afterwards,—for such a coming to him would be only additional sin, and no one really comes who is not renewed. It does not represent God, as some have a fashion of doing, as all and only love—welcoming, adopting love—an open, infinite heart ready to bathe them with all tenderness and mercy and so transform them. To men who have already abused all their lives such measures of uncovenanted mercy as have been poured upon them, this is only a warrant for thinking lightly of sin and salvation, and falsely of the high and awful character of God. It is to confound and destroy spiritual distinctions. Showing mercy unto thousands of them that love him and keep his commandments; this is his unalterable character. And the Gospel assures every man that the only way to approach his mercy, even in Christ, is to give up one's sins, make to himself a new heart, cease to do evil and learn to do well, break off sin by righteousness and iniquity by turning unto the Lord. There may be great intellectual difficulties in persuading a heathen to believe; so great that it may in some sort be true of him, as of the Jews, this is the work of God to believe on him whom he hath sent; but this is never the greatest difficulty, and whenever a heathen can believe, it is because he has repented. And when he repents, faith in Christ will ordinarily follow, if Christ is truly presented.

7. Some perplexing questions of character here resolve themselves. Men whose spiritual renewal and fidelity to the right are not to be doubted have done great harm to the truth as it

is in Jesus. The confounding that specific faith which follows a change of heart with change of heart itself has caused many to perplex themselves needlessly and painfully, and often injuriously, with the question, are these who have so lapsed into error, after all, good men? No suggestion of the difference between errors of the head and errors of the heart relieves the difficulty. Faith in Christ as an atoning Saviour is pre-eminently the act of the heart. But it is not all, nor the first thing the heart does in returning to God. The cases now adverted to are not cases of the loss of all faith; general faith,—very deep, very hearty, very child-like,—may remain, though specific faith in the work of Christ may be removed from its foundations. Righteousness remains, though it may be under special peril of becoming self-righteousness. Piety, in its multiform exercises, remains, though the soul may come into danger of making a merit of it, having lost sight, in great measure, at least, of the meritorious sacrifice of Christ. These are not cases of the putting away a good conscience toward God or toward man and so making shipwreck of faith; the shipwreck coming without putting a good conscience away. They were converted under an unquestioning traditional belief in the cross perhaps, and by some process have come to deny the very vicariousness of the Great Sacrifice; they once believed in the Lord that bought them, though now they deny that he bought them by being a substitute for their sins; possibly they have taken out of the Gospel the very Gospel element itself, the good news of the way in which God shields us from the consequences of sin; possibly they make our repentance and renewal the one end of Christ's mission, excluding with superior creature ends all Creator ends, and all fitting means, or denying that his work is governmental at all, or that he makes any interposition for men as one who has the government laid upon his shoulders; they may exaggerate and distort his merciful love as something which, in protecting us, does nothing that seems worthy or effective (save in a mere personal way, appealing only to personal sentiment), to protect law; they may construct a theology with such a front of kindness and grace that justice is hidden, and faith in mere love is made to go before and run to repentance; they may fail

to dislodge selfishness by leaving out the self-sacrificing substitution of our Lord and Saviour which so powerfully rebukes it; they may encourage selfishness by setting forth God's forgiving goodness as so unconditional and free that it provides no substitution, in any sense, for sinners; they may thus do great injustice to the plan and great harm to the work of salvation; but if there has been in themselves a spiritual renewal unto God, any experimental change of heart and communion with God, while we may earnestly exclude the error of their teaching, no commission has been given us to exclude them from the kingdom of heaven. So far is the scriptural meaning of the phrase "fallen from grace" from implying the loss of regenerate character, that one may doubtless thus depart from the grace scheme of pardon without such a loss, to say nothing of what we mean by the perseverance of the saints. The foundation stands though the superstructure has been by a flood swept away. The reverse of this could not be, *i. e.*, repentance and holy love cease and real faith remain, for superstructures can not stand without a foundation to stand upon. Though there may be unbelieving penitents to some extent; impenitent believers the kingdom of heaven does not recognize. The primary, saving fact with every man is a change of heart. As all men are to be pardoned through the blood of Christ (for in him we have redemption, *through his blood*, even the forgiveness of sins), and as a pious heathen, dying before he hears that Christ suffered in our stead, the just for the unjust, must be saved through that very characteristic of his work which he does not receive, so with the theologian who denies a blood-bought redemption. And this though we do not care to inquire, which of the two cardinal elements of Christian salvation is the more important, for this is not the question at all. Which is antecedent? We may say that doubtless an unworldly, high-purposed, spiritual teacher of error, like that rare soul who led our American Liberalism, is inconceivably safer than one whose religious experience is honeycombed and empty of all living orthodoxy by being characterized by a correct but selfish faith. The injury such teachers have done to truth and right will doubtless be forgiven, and they themselves accepted on grounds of recon-

ciliation with God which their belief excludes, and which they theoretically deny. So far from narrowness is our generous New England faith.

8. It is easy now to explain why so much misdirected labor to advance God's work in Christian lands is fruitless. Professing Christians often say, in a very untimely way, sometimes in a merely mechanical and imitative way, "the trouble is our lack of faith. That is what we want, if we had only faith enough, that would carry every thing forward." Doubtless this is always a want. But there is a deeper one, out of which this grows. Our Saviour indicated it, in one form of it, when he asked: How can ye believe which seek honor one of another, and seek not the honor which comes from God only? The insurmountable obstacle lay farther back, in their temper and life. Mistaken efforts for a mere increase of faith, ignoring this obstacle,—and faith in such cases always means mere confidence of success—never succeed to any spiritual result. Backsliders always love to try to recover confidence first, passing by the process of thorough return to God and duty. They desire to strike in beyond that at the point of victorious and joyful faith. And there never could be a genuine reviving of God's people on the backsliders' plan. The best way to secure a deep and revived piety is to go right to the conscience, work deeply and thoroughly with that, and let the believing faculties alone till afterward. The greatest effort is to make men realize that a heart right with God is essential to prosperity. The danger in a Gospel land is not of not believing, but of presumptuously, impenitently believing. So Gospel-hardened sinners always need an ethico-spiritual repentance. They have worn out the atonement as the sublimation of all religious motive. This is the secret of their hardening. They always have accepted Christ as answering to the prophecies. The head is right, and the heart can not be so till the love of sin is dislodged therein.

With some men, indeed, the law in the Gospel may have an effect which the law by itself has not had. To some men Christ may be made the law in exemplified action, "drawn out in living characters." Other men may be impervious to law-

effects save through their softer emotions. The goodness of God leads them to repentance.

"A bleeding Saviour I have viewed
And now I hate my sin."

The concomitants of repentance are very various. But the theology of the subject stands. In the conscience and the consciousness, *somehow*, the groundwork of repentance must first be developed. The ethical element is of primary importance. Save in the right ethical attitude, men *can not* come to Christ. Be converted and I shall heal them, is our Lord's invariable order. And though it is an easy mistake to try to make the Gospel do the work of the law and the law the work of the Gospel, it is the economical and divinely successful way to keep each to its own proper work. Each then will do the more. Take the law for moral effect, and then the vicarious sacrifice will show its power to do a yet further work, viz., to reconcile and justify the sinner by faith. He who can get his own moral consent to repent will be glad to believe. The laws of his mind all favor it. It is comparatively easy. And he who is exalted as a Prince and a Saviour to give repentance, will surely, if this is profound and adequate, give faith.

ARTICLE II.

THE SELF-EXISTENCE OF GOD.

1. God is self-existent, first, in that he did not take his origin from another. He does not owe his being to any other person; or to any law, or principle, or efficiency of any kind whatever foreign to or separable from himself.

The declarations of the Bible on this point are explicit. The persons and things now existing had no concern with the origin of God; they did not fashion him, but he them; the highest

orders of spiritual existence, the principalities and powers of heaven are declared to be subject to him as the author of their being. The most prominent and illustrious objects of the material world, the earth with its productive agencies, the sun, and moon, and stars are expressly included in the same reckoning. All things have not made God; but all things were made by him. The testimony is equally decisive with regard to whatever might be supposed to have existed previous to the present order of things and from which his life might have been derived. There has been no series or generation of gods of which he is only one, and the second or third. Before him, we are told, there was no God formed. He is himself the Ancient of Days. There was nothing earlier than himself from which his being could have taken its beginning. His being never had a beginning, but from everlasting he is God. In this respect therefore God is self-existent, that his being did not spring from anything besides himself.

It will follow as an obvious inference, that as his being was not derived from any foreign source, so neither were its original laws impressed upon him by any such agency external to himself. His constitution was not appointed for him by another. The arrangement and balancing and harmony of his attributes were not the work of some other designing hand. The modes and limits of his action were not appointed for him in his making, as ours are for us. There was no law imposed upon him like the law of running for a machine, or like the laws of vegetable growth, or like the instincts of animal life, or like the laws that control the working of the mind of man. And this holds not only with regard to the working or moving powers of the divine being, but also with respect to what may be termed its powers of rest, its fixed principles or standards of determination or judgment. These were not set up by another. And these things are true alike as to every part of the being of God. His moral life is included. His power to discern holiness, his resolution to choose it and adhere to it, his repugnance towards the opposite evil, these, with whatever sentiments or emotions or exertions of any moral sort belong to him, are his own in their origin, and were not imparted to him by another.

It may thus be broadly stated that nothing in the entire constitution of God ; no principle of judgment, or rule of taste, or law of procedure, whether relating to power or intelligence or affection, nothing of any kind whatever belonging to his endowment in being was ever originally bestowed upon him, or in any wise made up or fashioned or determined by any agency distinct from him. The substantial matter of this proposition, if applied to man, would be mostly covered by the term nature ; by which we designate those laws or principles of our being impressed upon us when we received our individual life by some agency or agencies existing before ourselves. God has no such nature. As there was nothing before himself to give him life, so there was nothing to determine any order or rule of that life ; that is, to fix its nature. He is self-existent therefore in this, that he had no creator and consequently no original lawgiver.

2. God is self-existent, secondly, in that he does not depend upon anything besides himself. He possesses a being not only underived in its origin and in all its primitive endowments, but also a being capable of directing its own activities and of compassing its own ends, independently of all external control or influence. It might have been conceived of as possible that although God in his primal being was not fashioned by any power without himself, yet he might concurrently with his existence find himself subject to restraints or checks of some sort, not of his own imposition. It might thus be supposed that there were other Gods also besides himself, having a being as underived as his own, but whose existence would necessarily set bounds to his power, and whose will, either singly or in combination, might impose laws upon him. But there is no such partnership in deity. God himself has said that as there was no God before him so neither is there any other beside him. His words are : I am God, and there is none else ; I am God, and there is none like me. There has been no division of sovereignty, as there was no succession. The same words of Scripture that sweep away all fellowship in being and dominion with the one living and true God do also deny all possibility of any other limitation or dependence to be put upon him. These limitations or dependencies, of whatever sort they might be, must have had their

origin in some person, and there is no person to have established them.

It has indeed been imagined that an independent and solitary God might be introduced into a theatre of being so ordered as that he should be compelled to shape his action, though not according to the will of any other person, yet in conformity with some necessarily existing framework of things. So there might be a locomotive engine self-fed and self-driven, yet held to run upon lines of track already laid down. But all such suppositions are aside from the purpose. There is no one to lay down the track; there is no one to decree any antecedent order; or to prepare any framework of things; or to drive the bolts of any so-called necessity. There was no creation, whether of necessity or of any thing else, before there was a creator, and there can be none afterwards capable of putting law upon God except at the hand of another creator, and there is not another.

Down into this gulf, tumble at one step all theories of "immutable morality," or of "the eternal fitness of things," or of whatever other name, in which it is attempted to find a standard of virtue and right independent of God. There can be no such standard except in another and a greater God. Virtue and morality are not "things"; they are not in things. And if they are, there were no things before God, and there are none apart from and above him. But they are personal. They are the laws or facts of personal life. And with respect to God, the rules of his life, if they are anywhere beside in himself, must be in another, who is then God. But the Most High himself has said, looking throughout his own immensity and along his own eternity: I am the first and I am the last, and besides me there is no God. The laws of his holiness are not ordained by another, but they are ordained in himself. And with regard to natural necessities, or necessities in reason, or necessities of any other kind, that may be supposed to have power upon God in the way of hindering or directing his action, all their necessity if they have any comes of him, and is first in himself. If God can not make something to be the same with nothing or a circle the same with a square, or a part equal to the whole, it is because the facts of substance and shape and the principles of

reason are firmly planted, not without but within himself; and because he has established all things to agree with himself; and because he will not, can not, deny himself. The rules of right, the principles of reason, the facts of substance, the moulds of shape and solidity, whatever in the moral or the intellectual or the material worlds there may be of necessity and firmness, all these are there because they were first in God. They have not fallen in around him from without; they have gone out themselves from him. The rigidity and setness of things has not stiffened about God to hold him in his motions; but he holds it to make it so. For all that is orderly and steadfast in the universe of matter and intelligence and will, God, and he only, without aid or counsellor, has stretched the line upon it and fastened its foundations and laid its corner-stone. God is therefore seen to be in no wise dependent upon these principles of things that are so solid and enduring. He is as free from all control from them as he is from any possibility of restraint or any necessity of help by the interposition of any rival or any friendly God. He is in this respect as in every other, sufficient unto himself.

And if any inquiry should here be made for the relation in which God may stand to beings whom he has created, and to whom he has given certain limited powers of action partially independent of his own, and even in opposition to it, it is enough now to answer that the existence of every such being, and along with that, the performance even of all its actions most hateful to God, has still been determined on by him in the exercise of his own independent choice. The actions of his creatures, in themselves considered, may displease and grieve God, but they have no such deep power upon him as to break his plans or to shake him from his happiness. For all that is most solid, our dependence is on him, and not his on us. It may still be affirmed of him, and in a sense altogether unlike that in which the words could be spoken of any other being, that he does according to his own pleasure, in heaven and on earth.

God is thus self-existent in this second particular that he depends upon nothing besides himself.

3. God is self-existent, thirdly, in that there is no other existence towards which his being is directed and in which it has

its end. It terminates perpetually upon itself, and nowhere else. As there was no God, and no agency before him from which he was derived, so neither are there any to follow after him, in which he will be swallowed up, and cease to be. He will remain forever, as he ever has been, a supreme and single God. He is as strikingly distinguished in this respect, from all natural existences, as he is by the possession of his uncaused and independent life. The beings with which we are familiar in our daily business—and we ourselves with them—are enduring only for a time; they pass away and individuals of a new generation arise to take their places. The life we have known wears out, and new plants, or animals, or men, are in its stead. But it will not be so with him. He will never give way to the youthful God of a new generation. He has said that there shall no more be any God after him than there was before him. He is the ending as well as the beginning. His sign in these letters of being is both Alpha and Omega. He will eternally continue to be that which he has been eternally.

Here also as before, the scope of the truth covers the whole field of the life of God. His personal being is never to be replaced by another; and not only that, but during its continuance, and perpetually, all its intellectual and moral directions are toward itself, and not another. This is the truth taught in the Scriptures when they say that God acts for his own glory. However often it may be denied, and however oftener misapprehended, it is that truth of all, concerning the divine procedure, which lies down most closely upon the bottom stones of reason. God is governed in all that he does by his own perfect being, because there is nowhere another like it in its perfection. He acts for the manifestation of his own glory because there is not another self-sustained and essential glory to be manifested.

The doctrine of the unchangeableness of the divine purpose is herein also involved. As his personal being endures, unwasting, and as he has no ends outside of himself, his counsels are incapable of change. They can not be shifted, for there is no other, or new point on which they could be fastened. Himself from eternity the Father of lights, no new lights are ever dawning upon him.

In these three respects, therefore, the self-existence of God is to be affirmed; that his being was never given by another; that it has never been dependent upon another; and that it is never destined to pass away into, or to be lost in another. And in each of these particulars there has appeared, to our thought at least, a twofold division: one relating to what may be called the constitutional being of God, and the other to his moral conditions. He is thus (1) underived, (2) independent, (3) indestructible; and corresponding to these on the moral side, he is (1) without the sense of obligation, or instinct of duty given him in his making, (2) without restraint, (3) without responsibility. Or to repeat them in a different form, he has no maker, no sustainer, no destroyer or successor; and answering to these, no lawgiver, no governor, no judge.

Thus far the subject has been treated negatively. The self-existence of God has been defined in the way of denials. We have considered things that are inconsistent with it, and have not attempted to affirm positively what it is itself. This was most hopeful and safe, for over on the other track the ascent grows shortly too steep for the foot. If any attempt that way were to be made, there might be nothing better than to say that God as self-existent is a being complete within himself. He is complete (1) in his origin. The negative statement was before that no one made him, that he had no origin. The positive one now is, that he is perfect in it; that he has a complete and reliable basis for his being within that being itself. He is complete (2) in his activities, in that he has the free and perfect use of all his powers, in all directions. The former negative statement was, that nothing existed to restrain him. He is complete (3) in that his activity returns perpetually upon himself, so that his springs of life are forever full. The previous negative assertion here was, that his being is not wasting away, and destined to be swallowed up in any other. The first and third relate to establishment, or continuance in being; the second to contents or sweep in it. Together they mark out a life within itself thoroughly settled and capacious.

If now we are required to vindicate before the bar of natural

reason belief in such a being, the process will be short. If reason can not demonstrate or comprehend it, it yet demands it, and falls from its foundation without it. There must be a bottom of things somewhere. We can not think that one depends on another and that upon a third beneath, and thus continuously. There must be something that does not depend, and that stands of itself. Existence indicates self-existence. A denial may doubtless be put against this, and it may be said that the universe has perhaps with it nothing anywhere of real subsistence, but is, throughout its depths, what it seems to be on its surface, an unstable succession of matters not to be rested on. But the universe will not of its own motion step into this gulf without a bottom, even if it might. Suicide of all being is not reasonable. It is most natural and proper to stand on the firm shore. By reason therefore we look rightly for some solid ground. This is what the Bible affirms is found in God.

Our observations upon nature may also confirm the scriptural statement that this solid basis of being is in a spirit rather than in any form of matter. There is an apparent tendency in things to grow stable and enduring as we pass from the grosser to the more refined textures of being. The individual, visible forms of vegetable and animal life fall to pieces in a little time, and are never restored, but the unknown power that presides over their growth and their decay is more ancient than the memory of man, and more unchangeable than the rocks. The mountains and the continents, as we see them now, have endured for but a fraction of the age that belongs to the unseen forces beneath that have lifted them to their places. Their rising and falling is but a single breath of the long-continuing life that beats unwatched in the hidden bosom of the earth. The globe itself is but a fleeting thing along with the hoar antiquity of the mighty but ethereal agents that bind together its materials and control its motions. Everywhere that which approaches toward the spiritual grows firm and lasting. It is reasonable to conclude that the abode of central steadfastness may be in a pure and perfect spirit.

It is equally natural to infer that this central and self-sustaining spirit is a person. Personality is the home of power. In-

telligence and all ability to originate or direct activity, whether physical or moral, are found whenever we are able to trace them to what seems to be their source, with individual being. The personal will exhibits the only approach to the qualities of self-possession and self-support that is anywhere open directly to our view. It is rational, then, to believe that the spirit within which these powers are dwelling in their full stability is a personal God.

So the Bible declares that it is. On every side, and from every border of the creation the lines of firmness and sustenance run that way toward the King, eternal, immortal, invisible. It is he only of all that exists that, surveying his own being, can say of himself: **I AM THAT I AM.**

ARTICLE III.

THE MORAL USES OF CIVILIZATION.

CIVILIZATION stands in contrast with barbarism. It supposes a degree of order and elevation in society. It is found always in connection with government and law. It fosters industry and enterprise, and favors morality. It affords material for history; it has usually been recorded upon the pages of history. It supposes a degree of mental culture; gives growth to institutions, where justice is recognized, personal rights are protected, and the intellect and the taste are cultivated.

In the civilized state, man comes to have an idea or sense of his natural wants: and to have a measure of enterprise, ambition and ingenuity to supply them. He is supposed to have some regard for the rights and wants of others. It recognizes the human relations, and prompts to the exercise of the humanities, and some of the responsibilities that grow out of these.

The civilized condition is opposed to the habit of civil and social seclusion. It leads men to mass themselves in society.

It is averse to national monopoly, and individual isolation. It regards human relations, and protects them, and provides for natural and national wants.

The status of civilization has differed somewhat in the successive ages of the world. Historians speak of the semi-civilized state, or half-civilized conditions; and then of a state of entire, or complete civilization. These expressions are somewhat generic and arbitrary. A perfect state of civilization has never existed, save in the imagination or conceptions of men. From this ideal state downward, there would be found naturally, grades of civilization distinguished by slight shades of difference, till a state of barbarism and social disintegration is reached.

We now assume that there is a tendency in the nature of man toward a degree of order and cultivation. Society has often, under great disadvantages, worked itself up into a state of comparative civilization. Every age of the world has given illustrations of this fact. We should naturally expect that it would be so. God made man a rational being, and for certain human conditions; with subjective tendencies and aspirations toward an objective good. The civilized state is a rational fact: it is in some sense a natural state; it is, at least, a possible objective good. We would, therefore, suppose that the human mind would discern these facts, though dimly, perhaps, and would instinctively aspire after a normal condition. It is natural that man should in some way come to a knowledge of his constitutional wants; and make effort to supply them. We would expect that the human mind would reach out toward its proper sphere and ultimate destiny. We would expect to discover a relation, more or less distinct, between the conscious necessities and destination of man, and the distinctive workings of the mind with reference to them. It is not absurd to suppose that this inborn perception, or consciousness, would act upon the mental and voluntary forces, and lead to some of the great problems of life; such as tend to the relief of natural wants, and to social and civil organization.

The knowledge of our necessities tends to stimulate thought, to stir the desires, quicken invention and art, and lead to the discovery of natural laws and resources. An ancient philoso-

pher has said, that necessity knows no law, which is true, no doubt, in the sense intended. The converse of this is true, also; necessity *leads* to law, in awakening interest, and sharpening the intellect, to meet the necessities of life and make provision for the future.

And, then, man was made for order and government. The civilized state is the normal state of society. The notion that government is a compromise, entered into by the individual, as between society and individuals who surrender some of their personal rights to obtain a counterbalancing good, is a false idea, and is fatal to the interests of civilization. Man has no right to live in a state of separation from society. He has no right to assume a state of civil or social isolation; to be a law unto himself, and a *state* unto himself? Man has no right to assume independence of civil government. It is not in accordance with his nature, or with the interests of society. If this be so, man *gives up* no rights in coming into society and under government. He can not give up a right which he never possessed. If he had no right to live in a state of solitude, or independently of society and government, he surrenders no rights when he recognizes and conforms to government. His relation to it, therefore, is no compromise. It is a natural one.

If man was thus made for society and law; if his welfare and interests are found in this line, we would expect that he would grope, at least, toward this condition. If instinct is quick to see its normal relations, is it absurd to suppose that reason would feel after these relations? The bee tends towards a commonwealth. It discerns and obeys law. So the bird of passage; so the industrious beaver in his toil of life. These tend toward government and a commonwealth of interests and order. And throughout the universe, so far as we can see, wherever life depends on other life, and the individual interests on a community of interests, there will be seen a tendency toward association and order. Each one takes rank by instinct or impulse according to the nature of the creature and system in the case, and conforms, readily or tardily, to the commonwealth of toil and interest for which each one was made. And may we not expect that reason, with its various guides and aids, would come

to something like a similar result with respect to human interests and obligations, unless hindered by passion, or unhinged from natural law by disobedience?

It is on this ground, thus briefly gone over, that we made the assertion that there is a tendency in man toward a state of civilization. Man is restless as the wave, till he finds his normal condition. His attempts, however, to reach this condition, owing to influences that we are soon to consider, are often abortive, or abnormal; as noticed in the clans and tribes under which men often arrange themselves; or into which society is broken. But even in these conditions, a tendency is seen to associate tribe with tribe, clan with clan, till something like a confederacy is reached. Sometimes through war and conquests consolidation comes, and empires are founded. Thus the weak become strong, and the many one. In one way or another, we would expect that man would move, irregularly, no doubt, but actually, toward conditions that are natural, unless hindered by strong counter-tendencies.

At this point, we notice the effect of sin on the constitutional tendencies of man; on the desires and habits;—leading to disintegration; on the conscience and sense of obligation, turning the moral nature into currents of selfishness; on society, in obliterating the law and bond of love; and generally, in the direction of depravity and wickedness. We admit these tendencies: but they are not such as to cancel responsibility, or take from man the obligation to be what God made him to be. There is left the capability for normal action, and enough of natural ability and moral consciousness to lead him to seek some of the forms of rational and civilized life.

It is said there are disadvantages in civilization; such as are not found in the simpler and lower states of man. We are pointed to excesses and extravagancies in civilized life, that tend to corruption and effeminacy. This is no doubt so. In coming to a knowledge of his necessities, man often becomes the victim of unnatural tastes and desires. A herd of sleeping passions are aroused. The march of civilization quickens often into a

rush for enjoyment and sensuous pleasure, that ends in social degeneracy, derangement and ruin.

But in juxtaposition with every blessing, lies a corresponding danger. Temptation reaches out the hand always to a forbidden *good*. The tendency of action, in perverse conditions, is always to over-action. The momentum deemed necessary to carry a body to a given point, often hurls it beyond that point; which necessitates reaction; so that the exact point or mean becomes the centre of a perpetual vibration from extreme to extreme, as of a pendulum.

No doubt, man in consequence of the fall, fails to attain to his highest destiny, or the best human condition. We have to confess that the great mass of mankind fail of their proper destiny, altogether, by reason of sin. To this sad fact, there is properly *no* exception. We have to confess that the disturbing influences that hinder civilization are such as the forces of civilization themselves can not remove. It can not be affirmed that as knowledge advances and civilization rises, and becomes more brilliant, fascinating and powerful, the *moral* condition will be necessarily improved. The converse of this is often true, as will be shown.

This fact indicates the necessity of a higher and stronger force in society than comes of mere civilization. We find here one of the moral uses of civilization. It indicates higher wants than itself or its own proper forces can reach and supply. It indicates, by its defects, the higher moral wants of man. It thus indicates the grander provisions of providence. So the deficiencies of civilization in its very best forms, lead to an argument for, and the expectation of, a better dispensation of heaven, to meet the necessities of a lost world. As irregularities and anomalous indications in the planetary system forced the speculative mind away from the system itself, to account for these; and thus led to the discovery of still other orbs in space; so irregularities and anomalies in the best forms of civilization in their failure to meet man's moral wants, show the necessity of something superior to these; and force the mind to look for it as an additional dispensation, as the crowning gift of God to man. So it is that civilization has tended, neg-

actively, toward the Christian religion. This leads us to notice the closer relations of civilization to Christianity. These may be styled *proper*, and also *providential*.

We are to regard civilization in its highest form as an outgrowth of Christianity. A state of perfect civilization must needs have its source in the Christian religion. Taking man as he is, there is nothing short of pure Christianity that can give him a right commonwealth, or any thing like the lost paradise.

On the other hand, we are to regard the kind of civilization produced and sustained by any one force, as a test of the genuineness, and the criterion of the excellence of that force. If so, the civilization, connected with Christianity in its several forms and phases, is to be regarded as a *test* of its purity. By its fruits it is to be known and judged.

It must be admitted that the Gospel system, which reveals the relations of God to the world, and those of a lost world to God, is more favorable to civilization vastly than polytheism or forms of natural religion. Christianity has within itself the elements needed to establish and sustain the highest form of civilization; for it has the power to regulate the human desires and tastes, and to subdue the tyrant passions of man. Surely, if the Gospel is able to fit men for heaven, it is capable of fitting them for earth. If it has power to do the greater, it must needs have power to do the less. A permanent and completed civilization, therefore, is a product or sequence of a pure Christianity. And here is one of the moral uses of civilization, in standing as an index or test of the genuineness of Christianity; as also in the testimony it bears to the power and excellence of Christianity.

We have said that the mind naturally tends toward some form or degree of civilization. Man is inclined to work into some condition of social and civil order. Commerce favors this, and has always been regarded as a civilizing agent. Other causes tending to this result have been noticed. But the civilization thus reached is material, defective, and uncertain. It stops short of meeting the essential wants of man; or else rushes beyond his normal necessities and desires, to create artificial and vitiated ones. There is a tendency in government also, either to excess or defect; to govern too much or too little, and

by laws too stringent or too lax. Christianity is an equalizing and balancing force. It restrains and regulates, as well as renovates; and so becomes a healthful force in civilization, as well as an originating cause.

And it is to be noticed that the workings of society in its primitive state toward a condition of civilization are necessarily slow and unsteady. Entire races are found that have failed even to approximate toward this state, and have slept in ignorance and imbecility for ages. But Christianity, planted in those barren soils, works out the problem of civilization spontaneously. With such a stimulus at its roots, it rushes often toward maturity and bloom like tropical growths. And here, again, civilization testifies to the power and excellence of its parentage in Christianity. Under its influence, and regulated by its laws, civilization is normal and healthy; neither defective, nor excessive; but adapts itself at once to the common necessity, and the public good. It comes to be the crown of Christianity, as in another view, Christianity is the crown of civilization. And that which does so much for man in this world, can well be trusted as a provision or security for the world to come. It is proved to be friendly to all the relations of mankind, having respect to his whole being and his whole future. Such a style of civilization as comes of Christianity, is one of the highest testimonials to its value, showing it to be superior to education, to government, to literature, law, refinement,—or all these combined.

And as a *test* of the purity of the Christian religion as well as a *proof* of its power, civilization has its moral use. We have said, that the genuineness or spuriousness of that which is termed Christianity is demonstrated by the sort of civilization it produces. A well regulated and balanced civilization is affirmative and favorable in its testimony as to the genuineness of its source; while defective or extravagant civilization gives testimony against the purity of its origin. The form of Christianity that fails to regulate society, correct public abuses, and reform the public morals, must be set down at once as defective, if not worthless. Does the Christianity of our own land and times stand this test? Just so far as it fails to make men industrious,

temperate, moral and humane, it is found defective; it has fallen below the spirit and aims of the Great Founder.

We turn now to view the *providential* place held by civilization in the Christian dispensation. And here we notice another of its moral uses. We are taught to connect high intellectual culture with the influences of Christianity. We look upon paganism as a barren soil, both intellectually and esthetically. The human mind certainly needs the stimulus that comes from conceptions of spiritual truth, and sanctions drawn from eternity, to awaken profoundest thought, and so give the imagination its loftiest flight. We have supposed that the inspirations of genius have a more favorable field in the firmament of Christian truth than in blank atheism and idolatry. We have affirmed civilization to be a normal outgrowth of Christianity. It certainly is so. But we have conceded, moreover, that there are forms of civilization exceedingly valuable and brilliant that are not *directly* indebted to the Christian religion. Perhaps the best form of civilization ever produced by other forces or causes than the Gospel of Christ had crowned the earth just previous to the Christian era. In these, ancient Greece and Rome took the lead. We regard those empires that despised the Jewish religion and upon which not even the twilight of Christianity had dawned as having reached the loftiest summit of mental attainment. This was true, certainly, of the higher classes of society in that golden age.

We regard this proud eminence in civilization and culture reached by the ancients, as having a strictly *providential* use, in demonstrating to the world the *necessity* of Christianity. This it did by failing to meet the *moral* wants of the world. Natural laws and forces had been tried in their best forms, and in their most brilliant exhibitions of power, but had utterly failed to make men better or happier. This fact was proved on a most extended scale; and thus the world was taught, in the failure of all this power and splendor, to look for something better than civilization, and to receive the Christian faith as the grand relief of human want and restorer of human happiness.

The experiment of ceremonial law, under the Old Testament, had been tried; added to this, the experiment of *moral* law; but

these experiments had failed. There was a moral use in *that* failure, of shutting the world up to Christ as the only Saviour. Concurrent with these experiments it seemed good to the divine Providence to let the most splendid forces, embodied in the highest possible form of natural civilization and culture, have a world-wide experiment; that in their failure, the world might be taught the need of something superior to these, to reach that rest for which man seeks. Hope had need to come out of despair; the valley of Achor must needs become its door; and that upon which man had relied so fondly and proudly, must needs be shown to be unsubstantial and unsufficient to meet his highest necessities and ultimate destiny. The experiment is made and the failure reached, and both are on a most stupendous scale,—that the thoughts of many hearts might be revealed and confounded and so turned toward Christ, the only Saviour of the world.

In the golden age, science and law, government and philosophy had reached their climax, and were falling into decay, without conferring upon mankind any permanent moral benefit. The vast experiment had been made, and the failure reached, when Christ came upon earth, as the Saviour of men. All had been done that could be done in these other ways, and by these other forces and influences, to elevate the mind, strengthen society, and help the condition of man. Philosophy had done its utmost, art and law, science and literature and government and arms, had done their utmost; but all had failed to restore man to happiness; so the historians and philosophers of that age have told us. What, then, was accomplished by all this wealth and waste of thought and refinement? Was it indeed waste? Was it loss? No! it taught mankind the need of the true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world.

This grandest experiment of civilization, therefore, had a *providential* use, in showing the world the need of some one wiser than a Socrates, or a Solon, to teach the true wisdom. It tended to show man the need of the Infinite, to dwell with men in human form and personality, who should give to the world, instead of cold standards and ideals, the power of a living faith, that should make conquests which armies could not make; that

should control men whom laws and sceptres could not subdue, and achieve, in ways of moral conquest, what human might, and thought, and skill, and power had never been able to achieve; and thus open upward fields and heights of moral glory which the most learned and brilliant of earth had never gained, or even conceived. This experiment taught man *negatively*, the need of Christianity. God gave the world these vast dissolving views, and splendors of civilization, to teach men that nothing short of the Christian faith, attested by supernatural tokens and testimonials, could satisfy the moral wants, or mental capacities of mankind. So upon the ashes of all this splendor and failure, God set up a kingdom that shall stand forever.

The ancient civilization and culture had a moral use, further, in serving as a *medium for the embodiment and diffusion* of Christianity. There had been no time, perhaps, since the fall of man, when the literature of the world had been adequate to this task. Hegel says, man had not come to be respected enough to form a proper medium of the incarnation. He refers here, no doubt, to the necessity of a standard to be reached, through civilization and mental development, where man *as man* could command the respect of the world, and thus become a possible representative of the great moral ideas of the Gospel. Waiving these speculations, it is safe to affirm that the themes of Christianity had need, for their embodiment and diffusion, of a medium more accurate and perfect than the ancient Sanscrit, Syriac or Hebrew. It had need of the wealth and versatility of the classic literature of that golden age. This had already begun to be the property of the world. It had need, too, of that elevation of thought, and vigorous manhood, created by the ancient culture. The standard of intellect attained by the nomadic tribes of early time, was inadequate to grapple with the reasonings of the New Testament writers, and the mysteries of Christianity. The great thinkers that preceded the Christian age, had need to take the human character and intellect up to the capability of receiving and expounding the Christian theories.

Not that very much of mind or culture is required to accept the simple ideas of Christianity. The Gospel is fitted to the low-

est and the weakest. But a novice is not permitted to teach. While the most lowly may become learners in the school of Christ, yet the expounders of Christianity, the interpreters of the Gospel doctrines and mysteries, have need of clear discernment and disciplined minds. The Christian *faith*, that takes hold on Christ, may dwell in the hearts of the humblest, but the Christian *system*, the perfection of thought and principle, intended to contain the germs of a final and perfect civilization, and to be the theme of thought for the world in the millennial age, demands the best furnished intellects.

We have here a place and a plea for the great representative civilization, so to speak, of the world ; in the wisdom and literature it furnished for the final use of Christianity. There was need, at that age, for the highest standards of thought and taste, as a sort of casket to contain the jewel of Christianity, as the world's ornament and wealth and price ; and to convey it safely and suitably to mankind in all languages and ages. In this view of the case, we can see the moral value of civilization as an aid to Christianity, while its own value to the world positively, was nothing, in a moral point of view.

It only remains to be stated that the fruit of the ancient civilization and culture is yet being harvested by the nations in the high *mental culture* it affords. The ripe sheaves have reached our times. The philosophy and culture of that golden period have solid worth in the work of intellectual development and culture. The ancients were our superiors in certain respects. They excelled us in oratory and in literature ; possibly in the arts and sciences ; while in other respects they were greatly our inferiors. The use of their ideas and culture, in sharpening the intellect, and elevating the conceptions of men, is at once acknowledged. And the time will never come when those classics will cease to be admired as standards of thought and taste, and when their use in Christian education and refinement shall be no longer needed.

Yes, this culture that comes to us as a fruit of that old civilization is all needed now in the great work of Christianity. It is to be laid at the feet of Christ. It has great worth in fitting the mind for the last great work of the Gospel, in enlightening

the nations, and bringing the world to Christ. The Scriptures and the beginnings of a Christian literature have been put into the principal languages of the world since this century commenced. Only one fifth of mankind had the Bible in their language then ; now, nine tenths of the world have it in their vernacular ; so seven tenths of the human family have received the great boon of the Christian revelation and literature in less than half a century ! This is one of the achievements of the foreign missionary work. It is the greatest wonder and triumph of any age since the Christian era.

It is not easy to see how this great work of translation could have been done without the aid it received from the ancient Greek and Roman culture. It is in this way that civilization, the best and ripest forms of which are the outgrowth or product of Christianity, has paid tribute to her, in the culture it yields and the strength it affords for the defence of the Gospel and its diffusion over the earth. That civilization lasted till its great work was done. Its mission was strictly a *providential* one. It was the utmost that could be done for man without Christianity. But wanting this germ of an enduring vitality, this morally regenerating force, it sunk by its own weight. It is more properly said, from its own weakness. It was lacking just where the vital strength and principle should have been found, in elements of moral power and its provisions for man as a fallen creature, yet moral and accountable and immortal. It is to this test that all agencies and systems, used for the good of society, are to be brought. And that which can not stand this test, and thus fails, at this most essential point, to answer its end, must sooner or later, like the effete civilizations of the past, sift upon the earth their expiring ashes.

ARTICLE IV.

RITUALISM AND WORSHIP.

NEARLY eighteen centuries ago Plutarch wrote :

"If we traverse the world, it is possible to find cities without walls, without letters, without coin, without schools and theatres ; but a city without a temple or that practiseth not worship, prayers and the like no one ever saw."

And worship is not only thus universal, alike with those taught by revelation and those guided by the light of nature alone—but it is also the highest form of religious service. In it we withdraw furthest from the world, and approach nearest unto God. It engages the whole soul ; the intellect in the apprehension of our relations to God ; the sensibilities in the outflow of appropriate emotions, and the will, in the surrender of ourselves, as living sacrifices, laid upon the altar. Every religious sentiment—homage, gratitude, trust, penitence, love, joy—is expressed in the acts of devotion. The spirit of heaven quickens us while still on earth, as we are brought into sympathy with the worshippers before the throne.

All this is true of the simplest form of devotional service—when the individual soul in the privacy of the closet seeks access to God ; but as our relations to him are common to many, and the emotions excited and expressed in worship those which may be felt by all his children, it naturally and inevitably takes the form of a social act, and we go from the closet to the temple. In this public appearing before God, there is of necessity a certain degree of form. All things must be done decently and in order ; so the confusion of many voices gives way to the utterance of selected leaders in prayer and praise. A definite arrangement of the exercises is demanded, and it is most natural that the attempt should be made to give a certain dignity and stateliness to the ceremonial, by the decoration of the place of assembling, by use of symbols expressive of religious

ideas, by the aid of instruments of music, and by the vestments of those who minister in holy things. Nor can we say that this attempt is in itself, and under all circumstances, wrong. The arrangements which God himself appointed for Jewish worship were elaborate and splendid. No earthly temple has been more gorgeously adorned than that at Jerusalem. No larger retinue of robed priests has ministered at any altar. No musical services have been grander than the songs pealing from responsive choirs there. And on the great festivals the altars smoked with whole hecatombs of victims, while clouds of incense rose before the mercy-seat.

Still, though these were permitted rites, they belonged to a dispensation which was declared to be imperfect, typical and formal rather than of the spirit. They were adapted to those who were in spiritual childhood; not yet able to discern the invisible. It was intended that, in the fulness of time, and the brightness of a higher revelation, they should all be done away. This, however, has been too often forgotten, and we find in all ages a tendency with some to fall back from the grand simplicity of Christ to a worship made attractive by gorgeous forms, and then to rely upon these forms as containing the very essence of religion, and having in themselves a saving efficacy.

We have long been familiar with the perversions of true worship in the Roman and Greek Churches; but the last two or three years have witnessed a movement in the same direction in one of the great centres of Protestantism: a movement which, though the excitement attending its first appearance has ceased, is still progressing, and the results of which are yet to be developed.

There has always been in the Established Church of England an unreformed element. It became Protestant by the act of the king rather than by the demand of the people. The liturgy was shaped in many places with a desire to satisfy opposing parties, and still shows plain marks of the compromise. From the days of Archbishop Laud onwards the Romanizing tendency can be traced, centering at Oxford. In 1833 the Tractarian movement startled the Christian world by its vigorous and learned re-assertion of baptismal regeneration, the apostolical

succession of the priesthood and affiliated dogmas. This movement seemed to have largely spent its force, and the Broad Church party, tending in quite another direction, to be rising to power; when suddenly men heard of strange vestments and new ceremonies in the churches of the Establishment—from city to country the novel fashions spread, and all the English world began talking about "Ritualism."

It is difficult to say how many are definitely engaged in this advance. Some documents in its behalf have been signed by about two hundred of the clergy, but these probably represent only the more active; other hundreds of ministers, and thousands of laymen are in sympathy with them; an earnest and devoted company, as their opponents testify.

Looking at this movement, *externally*, it seems an attempt to approximate the services of the Church of England to the ritual of Rome. And when we consider that its leaders claim to adhere to the rubric of the Anglican Church, and keep within its permitted limits, it is wonderful how well they have succeeded in this. The English "priests," (as they are careful to call themselves) cast by with contempt, not only the academic gown, but the surplice; calling the latter in derision "a white frock," and the scarf usually worn with it "some yards of black silk with ragged ends." They substitute for these the amice, alb and girdle, stole, maniple and chasuble, names heretofore unfamiliar save in the Papal Church. These vestments are of different colors, often richly embroidered with the cross and other symbolic emblems. Upon the altars, before which, standing or kneeling, with their backs to the people, these vested priests, with numerous assistants, officiate, they place the crucifix and lighted candles, the burning censer and, more sacred than all, the emblems of Christ's sacrifice, which, having been consecrated, they bow down to in low, silent, adoring prostration and lift up for the homage of the people. While they still use the words and only the words of the English prayer-book, they have most ingeniously contrived, by intermingled bodily exercises and manœuvres, to present a very tolerable imitation of the Romish mass.

But this is only an external view. It is more important for us to seek out the *ideas and principles* which lead to and support these forms. In these we shall find even a closer approach to the Papal Church.

Here, deriving our knowledge mainly from two volumes of Essays published in 1866 and 1867, entitled *The Church and the World*, we would mention :

1. *The ritualistic idea of the Priesthood.* Some, like Dr. Whately, have contended that the Anglican clergyman is in no true sense a priest. Nothing could be more opposite to the position now taken. The Ritualists are stout defenders of the Apostolical succession and claim a place by the side of the sacrificial priests of the Greek and Roman communions.

Like those with whom they would form alliance, "they believe that they are the depositaries of mystical, preternatural influences, independent of any moral or spiritual graces, communicated to no one else but themselves." The priest, in their view, is "the indispensable channel of communication between God and man." They seek avowedly to break down ministerial individuality, and merge the man in the great office he holds; and one of their leaders has said that the rejection of their doctrine is tantamount to a rejection of the belief of any medium between the soul and God. It would be difficult to find anywhere stronger assertions than are made by them of the peculiar, official sacredness of those thus appointed to be mediators with heaven. Connected with this,

2. *Are their views as to Worship.* We think of this as the fitting expression of the reverence due to one who is our exalted Father to whom we can go ourselves, singly or in companies, whenever the heart craves the privilege, with the free outpouring of our desires and of our reverential love. They change this simple service into a kind of mysterious pageant. It is not intercourse with God, the created spirit speaking to the uncreated; it is a stately ceremonial in consequence of the performance of which certain favors are bestowed. The great archetype of Christian worship is said to be, "Christ's perpetual intercession as the high priest of his church." We are to "attempt to imitate and represent on earth what Christians

believe to be going on in heaven," and we are to "employ material symbols to shadow forth invisible powers." Hence, one of their leading writers makes the astounding assertion, "It is an axiom in liturgiology, that no public worship is really deserving of the name unless it be *histrionic*."

They have no wish to simplify the service or bring it near to the sphere of common life. We love to think of worship as blending with all our employments and hallowing familiar scenes; but they say, "one principal object in the ordering of the Ritual is to ward off the worship of the sanctuary from the ordinary actions of the world and sever between it and common life." They do not think it fitting to address God in the tones we use in common speech and so they sing to him in drawling cadences. When we enter the church, they tell us: "The world is to be left without, kept from the eye by the painted window which interposes heavenly objects and checks the wandering of the gaze to earthly things." It would be the natural correlative of such a theory that, when we go out of the church, religion is to be left behind us within—as being too sacred to be mingled with our daily cares.

Though it is not our object to refute these views, but simply to state them, we can not avoid the remark, how strange it would seem to impute a "histrionic" service to the early Christians, meeting in upper rooms, and from house to house, or going out by the river side to the place where prayer was wont to be made, in the happy time when there were added to them daily such as should be saved; how inconsistent all such ideas are with worshipping God who is a spirit, in spirit and in truth.

Connected with this peculiar view of worship, we notice,

3. *The doctrine concerning the Sacraments.* If the aim be to "represent on earth what is going on in heaven," there can be no act so solemn as presenting and pleading before God the sacrifice of Christ; and so the celebration of the Eucharist is the crowning act of devotion. To the Ritualists all worship centres in this august office. Christ is "really and spiritually present" with the consecrated emblems. Others go further: "The body and blood present are the same which were born and suffered, but they are not present in the same manner as when

Christ walked on earth." "Our Lord is adored as well as received in the blessed sacrament." The celebrant "kneels in acknowledgment and adoration of the divine presence." In words, expressing as profound awe as any believer in transubstantiation could use, they describe the priest, consecrating the bread and wine, as performing "the great act"—"his tremendous office."

They profess not to repeat the sacrifice of Christ, but to do what they do as a "perpetual memory" of that oblation, presenting the sacred emblems "in the outer court of heaven," as Christ presents his sacrifice in heaven itself. Thus in the sacramental system have they, as they claim, "the continuation of Christ's presence on the earth."

No Romanist could use stronger language concerning the efficacy of this and other sacraments than they employ. Here is their citadel. The point of the whole matter they declare to be: "Is the religion taught by the Church of England sacramental or non-sacramental?" Their position is that "the validity of these rites is dependent on the fulfilment of certain conditions, not on the part of the receiver, but of the celebrant." They believe in baptismal regeneration as firmly as did the early Jesuits in Canada, who strove by all manner of cunning tricks to sprinkle a little water on the infant savages while they uttered the mystic formula and rejoiced that, even by contriving the fall of a drop of sweetened water on the brow of a sick child, they might rescue a soul from perdition.

And, in the same spirit, they kneel at the altar to receive grace, not because they approach God in penitence or in faith, but because one stands there mysteriously endowed with the power of bringing Christ near and commissioned to bestow his gifts. They seem almost to be incapable of the conception of spiritual communion; and one of their leaders, speaking of the former state of things, says in pathetic tones: "Not a light was ever seen on a church altar, not a vestment, not a single ornament of the church existed, as though anything proper were needed to show the love of Christ which constraineth us." So absolute is their dependence on outward help.

Other views, which we need not speak of at length, follow naturally in the train of these; such as the duty of confessing to, and receiving absolution from, those entrusted with sacerdotal powers. And here, as well as in respect to their doctrine of regeneration in baptism, they assert with confidence that the English prayer-book favors their claims; since it directs in the office for the visitation of the sick a personal confession of sin, and then authorizes the priest to say: "By his (Christ's) authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Penance also, and self-mortification, clerical celibacy and monastic retreats for the devout of both sexes find favor with them; the development of their system tends more and more to undo the whole work of the Reformation; and, comparing the essays of 1866 with those of 1867, there is a marked advance in the extent and positiveness of their claims and the intolerance with which they regard those who differ from them.

It sounds oddly, and is somewhat amusing, to hear those who, rejoicing in "our beautiful liturgy," have so often pitied us for our unattractive service, now told that their own worship, without the modern improvements, is "bald and meagre," "unmeaning, inconsistent and indecent," "cold, dry and unimaginative." But so their brethren declare. We only hope they will bear these criticisms as composedly as we have borne theirs.

What then separates these sacramental churchmen from full fellowship with Rome? The offensive claim of papal supremacy. They look wistfully into the broad enclosures of Roman Catholicism. They long to have a share in the ancient traditions of the Western Church. Repeatedly, and in varied forms, they affirm, We are Catholics also. They propound their theory; the Catholic church has three branches; the Greek, the Roman, and the Anglican; and they urge humbly, "the English Church was cut off, it did not itself renounce the Roman Catholic Church." So with help of a few from the other branches they have formed an association for promoting a happy reunion.

But the manner in which their overtures have been received is quite instructive. The holy office of the Inquisition came down on the unwary children of its cure, drawn into this society, with the declaration, "The theory that the Christian church consists of three parts is a heresy," and "an association of prayer with those who hold this theory is scandalous."

The poor ritualists could not but remonstrate, though with their mouths in the dust. They humbly explained that they did not mean that the three churches had "equal right" to the name Catholic: "they spoke only of fact, not of right." Then came the final answer:

"The Catholic and Roman Church alone has received the name of Catholic. Whoever is separate from the one and only Catholic Church is in a state of wrath. Every soul, under pain of losing eternal life, is bound to enter the only Church of Christ, out of which is neither absolution, nor entrance into the kingdom of heaven."

Alas, that so much self-abasement should have been all in vain.

Archbishop Manning endorses all this, calls ritualism "private judgment in gorgeous raiment and divers colors," and declares the Catholic Church "supremely indifferent to all such levities."

Thus, at present, the matter stands between the Anglican Catholics and Rome. The latter will not yield, and sturdy English independence thus far refuses to acknowledge Papal supremacy, or deny the true priesthood of the Anglican clergy. In the end it seems not unlikely that this, like the Tractarian movement, will send a company of "converts" into the Papal Church. Others will strive to hold their chosen faith, as Dr. Pusey does to this day, within the Establishment.

There is also a party, of whom Dean Stanley is a prominent representative, which desires to see the English Church embracing, and tolerant of, widely diverse views; sheltering in its generous impartiality High Church, Low Church, and Broad Church alike. He has asserted that only by thus including those who differ can a church be truly national.

The legal questions which these new forms of ritual have

raised are yet undecided and, if the innovations should be pronounced unlawful, there will be many found ready to sunder the ties between church and state, and become "High Church Dissenters." This, also, is another possible result.

But leaving conjectures as to the future and all questions concerning the effect of this movement on the Church of England, the more vital inquiry remains:

What are its lessons for us?

First, *the evil of rigid forms of worship.* There is harmony between the precise requirements of a liturgy and such an outbreak of ritualism as we have been considering, with the attendant doctrines concerning worship, the priesthood and the sacraments. The restraints of liturgical prescription make worship artificial and, by turning the attention to the minute externals of the service, give them undue importance and sacredness. It is only natural under such a system to rely more and more on symbolic representations and acts, until lights must stand on the altar to represent the illuminating power of the truth, the incense ascend like the breath of prayer, and even the anointing of oil is needed to exhibit, as they tell us, "the unctuous richness of divine grace."

We may sometimes feel, when minister and people read together the solemn litany, that such a form would add interest to our worship and, for those who would heartily enter into it, it might possibly be a help; but as part of a system which represses the free outpourings of the heart, forbids the adaptation of our prayers to our changing circumstances, draws attention to innumerable minutiae of posture and response, exalts the form at the expense of the spirit, and so awakens a taste for worship which is "histrionic"—we are firmly to refuse such aid, "hating even the garment spotted by the flesh." It is not safe to yield even in a limited degree; because, as present experience is teaching, any save the simplest forms are almost sure to be abused and to become themselves the objects of our trust.

We have an inestimable advantage over those using written forms in the liberty of an exact adaptation of our words to the

demands of the hour. Say what men please of the dignity of the English Common Prayer, there are times when its fetters are galling. In 1866 the writer attended the service in St. Paul's, London, on the day set apart for fasting and prayer on account of the "cattle-plague." The Bishop of London officiated and the Lord Mayor and Council attended in state. It was the largest and most solemn service held on that day in the whole kingdom. The object was definite: but the ceremonial proceeded through the usual routine of morning prayer; the Psalter was chanted according to the selection for the day of the month; and in the whole devotional service, occupying nearly an hour and a half, less than five minutes were devoted to an attenuated prayer squeezed in, having reference to the great object of the august assembling.

A little earlier, in Paris, the Americans commemorated the birthday of Washington. An Episcopal clergyman was the chaplain, and the nearest approach he was able to make to the special object of the meeting was, the use of the brief collect from the funeral service, giving thanks for "all those who now rest from their labors." The prayers would have answered equally well for the commemoration of some departed king of the Sandwich Islands.

There is a stage of religious development when outward rites which appeal to the senses may be tolerated, perhaps are needful; but it is a stage of immaturity, Jewish, not Christian. As the kingdom of God advances, the dispensation of the Spirit is ushered in; the eye sees no Shechinah, but faith discerns one Invisible; he is honored not by shrines of gold, but the costlier altars of the heart; and, whether worshipped by priest or people, he regards not the vestment, but searches the inmost thought. New revelations disclose new and higher truths, bring the soul under mightier motives, expand it with grander conceptions of God, broaden and deepen life, put thoughts which were beyond sages within reach of children.

Is it not inevitable that with these changes the mode of communion with God should become more elevated, spiritual and free? Would we, dare we go back to the ways of the past? If there are any still longing for the outward and material, for

processions and vestments and fixed forms; shall we gratify them, and so keep them down under the old bondage with narrow ideas and feeble faith; or bid them throw off their bonds, rejoicing that the way to the Highest is now open to all and that love is more than sacrifice?

To excite, by ceremonies appealing to the senses, feelings which only counterfeit true devotion because there is no real quickening of the heart and conscience, must be pernicious. From the sanctuary, fragrant with incense and resounding with melody, one may go away, soothed and satisfied, to self-indulgent worldliness; we need a worship which shall bring us near to the unseen God, make us feel our immediate, individual relation to him, so that we shall depart humbled to the dust, yet roused to new toil and consecration.

While we thus learn to avoid rigid and sensuous forms, we may, secondly, find in ritualism strong evidence of *the power of the sentiments of devotion*.

We can not think that, as some represent, these multitudes are excited merely by a show of "ecclesiastical millinery." Punch says so, and the theory is worthy of the religious earnestness of its author. But no. The ritualists, as those opposing them admit, are thoroughly engaged and devoted.

They show us, therefore, how the human soul responds to the call to worship. It feels how great is the privilege of approaching God—how sublime the duty. We were made for such service, and even the unrenewed heart, in its instinctive cravings, "cries out for the living God."

The way to the holiest is now open to all. The priesthood of the new dispensation comprises all the redeemed. They, and not a select class, are appointed "to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." They, and not merely the one who leads, give efficacy to the oblation of prayer and praise.

Yet how few really rejoice in these services of devotion, or frequent our sanctuaries, in order to "kneel before the Lord our Maker." Many go to hear a man preach, and they call the church by his name. Prayer and sacred song are spoken of

as "the introductory parts of the service," when they are, in fact, the service itself. The devotional sentiments are often but faintly exercised.

We have said that we may not seek to remedy this by introducing more elaborate or splendid forms; the danger of abuse is too immediate and great. But can we not make more of our present services, simple as they are, and throw into them a heartier and more real life? The foundation of all such improvement must be the awakening of deeper conceptions of the importance and dignity of worship; of its high place as a means of honoring God and securing his blessing; and of the glorious privilege of all Christians in being called thus to minister before the Highest.

And when efforts have been made in this direction, can not those who conduct the services of the sanctuary do more to awaken interest in them? ¹

There is *the offering of prayer*. Shall it be merely the unconsidered utterance of the moment, or a lively state of the religious affections be thought the only needed preparation; or shall we seek to pray "with the spirit" indeed, but "with the understanding" also? Is aptness and comprehensiveness in prayer merely "a gift," as it is so often called, or the exercise of a power which, like any other, may be cultivated and improved? Can all the fitting topics—adoration, thanksgiving, confession, supplication, vows of consecration—each embracing a multitude of particulars, and different occasions requiring an apt selection; can these points be presented in due order and appropriateness without any forethought?

No other than mental preparation is needed, and of course we are not to seek polish and brilliancy, nor decorations of metaphor; but simple, lowly, reverent words. We are to speak to God rather than about him; praying, as some one has said, not "in circles but straight lines." And if we were more careful to mingle thanksgiving with our supplication, might we not bear with us the throbbing sympathies of a great number who now listen unmoved?

¹ This essay was originally prepared for an Association of ministers.

"Prayer is the utterance of want,
And needy man thus often prays ;
But gratitude, alas, is scant,
And so is praise.
"Yet 'tis a loftier feeling far,
When thus to God the soul can move ;
For fear and helplessness are prayer,
But praise is love."

If it be said in answer to all this that the Spirit will "help our infirmities," we ask whether we do not have the aid of the same Spirit in unfolding the way of salvation, and entreating sinners to be reconciled to God? And if this does not supercede the necessity of thought of our own in the one case why should it in the other?

Another department of worship is *the service of song*. How quickly would the unceasing conflict concerning congregational singing come to an end or, at least, be put in the way of future adjustment, if this were regarded as an act of worship and at the same time the importance of worship were suitably felt. The question would not then be, by which method shall we obtain sounds most pleasing to the delicate ear, but how in sacred song shall we best express the high praise of God?

The reason why it is so hard to rouse the people to engage in this exercise is, that few have any true conception of what they are called to do. The singing they suppose a kind of interlude, giving variety to the services or possibly affording refreshment; as we have heard it actually said, "it will perhaps *rest the congregation* if they will rise and sing a hymn." The idea of a company of believers, called to be priests, coming to God with their oblation of praise, is almost the last idea suggested; and what wonder that men think more of the effect on themselves, than of the mode of song which will be most acceptable to the Lord?

We do not say that choirs are to be discarded, or that trained and skilful voices may not well express the tender or grand significance of select passages of Scripture; but while we thus give interest and variety to the service, it can not be complete till the whole assembly with united voices pour forth their trib-

ute of adoration in the words of a true hymn of praise, not of a didactic poem.

We come to God's house to worship, for ourselves and not by proxy. We have a leader in prayer, because thus only we can avoid confusion ; but, by aid of the selected tune, we can unite without discord in the song : and what is it but neglect of duty to be silent if able to join in it, and what but a profanation to hire those notoriously godless to shout hosannas for us with impure lips ?

Yet we say again, congregational singing will never succeed till all feel that the service of song is worship, and worship the highest and grandest religious act. When men love to draw near to God, they will delight in thus honoring his name. President Edwards thus describes the result of a revival among his people : "Our public praises were greatly enlivened. There has been no part of divine worship in which good men have had grace so drawn forth, and their hearts so lifted up in the ways of God as in singing his praise. The people sang with unusual elevation of heart and voice."

The reading of God's Word also belongs to the devotional service of the sanctuary, and this, in like manner, we are to emphasize. Might it not be made far more effective than it is ? By more care in the selection to bring forth to view the less-familiar and often-neglected portions of Scripture ; perhaps by a series of Scripture lessons independent of the subject of the sermon, accompanied by brief, pointed words of exposition and application ; and by the constant endeavor for an appropriate and impressive style of reading, might not this exercise be made to take a higher place and engage more deeply the attention of all ? Never have we seen congregations more hushed and intent than when listening to one thus bringing to light the hidden treasures of the Bible.

Once more, the deep interest which in all ritualistic worship centres round the *sacrament of the Supper*, suggests the inquiry whether our view of this rite is not too cold and passionless. There may be error in deficiency as well as in excess. Is there not a truth underlying the gross error of transubstantiation, that is, the fact that in the Eucharist Christ is brought

peculiarly and specially near? Ought not this service to be more deeply regarded than it is, as most solemn and most comforting; revealing Christ, strengthening our faith, quickening our love, and so a most precious means of grace? Ought not believers to be taught the need of diligent preparation for it, and then the belief encouraged that when Christ comes near offering to his disciples his broken body and flowing blood, it is a season most favorable for fresh vows of consecration and for gaining new strength? Should not the minister show by his words and reverent mien that the administration of this rite is to him the highest office of his ministry?

These are hasty hints, but they are based on the conviction that an earnest effort to deepen the interest in the devotions of the sanctuary is greatly needed. As it is unwise to seek aid in new and more imposing forms, the more need of infusing a quicker life into our usual exercises. Surely in such endeavors we shall have the help of him who has "chosen Zion as his habitation."

The whole community needs to be instructed more thoroughly as to the place of worship in the Christian life. We rejoice in every call to active labor, but we must pray as earnestly as we work.

There are susceptibilities and even longings for this duty which can be quickly roused. Some, who will not enjoy preaching, may delight in the varied offices of devotion; they will not go to the sanctuary to listen to men, but may be attracted by the thought of appearing before their Maker. We may say it is superstition which fills the churches of the Romanists; but it is superstition which allies itself with the deepest instincts of the heart.

Exalting worship we shall fulfil the sacred declaration, "my house shall be called a house of prayer." The listless irreverence of posture and demeanor, which now often disgraces our assemblies, will cease. God more truly honored will be more ready to bless. And the earthly temple will become the true image of the heavenly.

Finally, in common worship we can manifest the true sympathy which unites Christians of different names. Their differ-

ences are forgotten when the heart only speaks. Calvinist and Arminian sing the same hymns, and the church of the early ages gives to us the undying melody of its *Te Deum* and *Gloria in Excelsis*. We thus get free from our wearisome disputes and rejoice in a catholicism broader than New England.

It is no unworthy desire which the ritualists profess for the unity of christendom. It is a longing for the accomplishment of the unfulfilled prayer of our Lord. And that which they seek through an outward conformity, we would strive for through the development of a deeper religious life.

Sometimes at our great missionary gatherings the multitude join in singing the same hymn in different languages; the words vary but the melody of the music brings all into sweet unison. It is a beautiful foreshadowing of the time when "one song shall employ all nations," and it shall be seen that, amid minor diversities of life and doctrine, true worship can bring all hearts together.

ARTICLE V.

EXEGESIS.

"But of that day and that hour knoweth (*οὐδείς*) *no one*; no, not the angels which are in heaven; neither the Son; but the Father."

—Mark xiii. 32.

UNITARIANS consider this passage as the sheet-anchor of their system; accordingly they announce it in great capitals, that "omniscience is the attribute of the Father only."

And it would seem that the method of exegesis which has usually been employed to explain Mark xiii. 32 is liable to objection. It leaves misgivings in the mind to affirm: "As *man*, Christ might be ignorant of the day of judgment, though as *God* he knew all things."

Have we not evidence unequivocal that "Christ knows all things"; "even all that the Father knows"; and that he is "*that One* who searches the reins and hearts," even to give unto every man according to his deeds? *vide* John xvi. 30, xxi. 17; Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22; Rev. ii. 23. Besides, is it not true that Jehovah only knoweth the hearts of all the children of men? 1 Kings viii. 39.

Can we not then rationally take a different view of Mark xiii. 32 from what is usually taken? Is there any necessity for supposing that Christ did not know when the day of judgment should be? Was it not his design in the connection to discourage *vain curiosity*; and to teach the disciples that they need not look to him for any revelation on the subject?

Are there not *certain times* "which the Father hath put in his own power?" Acts i. 7. Is not this the same as saying that there are times which it belongs not to the commission of Christ to reveal? And, accordingly, when the disciples asked a question concerning them, the Saviour said: "*It is not for you to know.*"

But observe that, in the connection of the text, the disciples had been saying: "*Tell us, when shall these things be; and what shall be the sign of thy coming?*" Instead of answering that question, he warned them against deception; and implied that, to keep them watchful, it was necessary that the day of judgment should be concealed: "Take ye heed, and watch: since ye know not when the time is."

And yet he informed them that they should have indications sufficiently plain for all practical purposes, if they would watch the signs of the times; indications as clear as the budding fig-tree is of approaching summer. But yet it pertained not to his commission to reveal it; nor need they expect it from angelic visitations. But God in his times would show it.

And now is there nothing to show that such is the meaning of the word here rendered "knoweth"? Just recur to 1 Cor. ii. 2: "I determined not *to know* anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified." How is this? Could Paul, at his pleasure, forget all that he had learned at the feet of Gamaliel? Could he ignore all knowledge except concerning Christ?

Or are we to construe it as his determination to *make known* nothing else besides Christ as a dying Redeemer, and suited to the wants of sinful men?

What then should hinder us from so construing a word derived from the same root in Mark xiii. 32? We see that it is consistent with the scope of the context. And we have seen evidence that Christ knows all things; and that there are times which the Father reserves in his own power. Why then should we not adopt the exegesis proposed? Is there any just objection to it? Hear what Schleusner, one of the best lexicographers, has said of it:

“Interdum quoque *οἶδα* habet *notionem hiophilicam*, ut sit, *efficere* ut *alius scire*; do cere; revelare; unde explicare poterit locus Marci xiii. 32; ubi *οὐδεὶς οἶδεν* significare videtur *nemo revelare potest*; quoniam Pater hujus rei revelationem sibi soli reservavit.” As much as to say: “Sometimes, also, the word has a *hiphil* signification, as it were, to *cause* another to know; to teach; to reveal; whence, perhaps, the place in Mark xiii. 32 can be explained; where *οὐδεὶς οἶδεν* seems to signify, *no one can reveal*, since the Father has secured to himself alone the revelation of it.”

If this exegesis be legitimate, it will free the system of the Orthodox from some objections that have troubled many minds. And it will not be necessary to array Mark xiii. 32 against the many plain declarations that Christ knoweth all things.

Besides, is it not absurd to say that *as man* Christ is ignorant of what *as God* he fully comprehends? It seems to be making *two persons* of our Saviour; while the exegesis above given appears to be legitimate, natural, and satisfactory.

ARTICLE VI.

CONGREGATIONAL SINGING.

WORSHIP consists of two parts, prayer and praise. These are the two wings which bear our souls heavenward. Preaching is not worship, though it is commonly associated with it. Preaching is addressed to men. Worship is honor paid to God. This is commonly done in words of prayer. But prayer alone is not sufficient to express the emotions of our hearts in view of what God is, and what he is continually doing for us. We must praise him also,—praise him not in words only but in sacred song—"Singing and making melody in your hearts unto the Lord."

Music is a help to devotion. When the heart is full to overflowing it must not only speak but sing. Jonathan Edwards, then newly converted, seeing as it were with new eyes "a calm sweet cast or appearance of divine glory in almost everything," "in the sun and moon and stars, in the clouds and blue sky, in the grass, flowers and trees, in the water and all nature," could not refrain from "*singing* forth with a low voice" his contemplation of the Creator and Redeemer. Singing is the natural and fitting expression of joy. "Is any merry, let him sing psalms." And it is noticeable that as persons, God's children that is, draw near to the heavenly world, they are more and more inclined to praise rather than pray. "Old Christians," says Romaine, "are much in praise." "The consolations of God are so abundant," said the dying Toplady, "that he leaves me nothing to pray for. My prayers are all converted into praise." Praise indeed is the highest form, "the bright, consummate flower" of prayer. It is not oftentimes till Christians begin to praise, that God hears and answers their supplications. This is the most delicate expression of our confidence in God, when we praise him for blessings which he has only promised, but which we know he will bestow, in answer to earnest, believing prayer. King Jehoshaphat, when he went forth against the children of Ammon, "appointed singers unto the Lord, that should praise

the beauty of holiness, as they went out before the army and to say, Praise the Lord for his mercy endureth for ever." That was a strange order of battle,—a band of singers to go before praising the beauty of holiness, but it evinced the highest generalship; for no sooner did the singers begin to sing, and to praise the Lord, than the Ammonites were discomfited and put to the sword; "and they were three days in gathering of the spoil, it was so much." So too it was not until the priests had come out of the holy place, where they had deposited the ark under the wings of the cherubim, "as the trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound to be heard in praising and thanking the Lord, and when they lifted up their voice with the trumpets and cymbals and instruments of music, and praised the Lord, saying, For he is good for his mercy endureth forever";—it was not until then, that the cloud of the divine presence filled the temple, so that the priests "could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud; for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of God." It is to be noted also that, in the march of the children of Israel through the wilderness, the tribe of Judah led the van, and Judah signifies *praise*. So the banner of praise is ever borne aloft before the people of God, in their advance through the wilderness of this world to the land of promise that lies beyond. We often speak of the power of prayer, and prayer is, in a sense, omnipotent, for it moves the arm that moves the world; but praise opens the very heart of God, and disposes him to do for us "exceeding abundantly above all we can ask or think."

Praise, however, is not expressed in song alone, though this is the most fitting and beautiful vehicle for carrying up to God our offerings of love and thanksgiving. And hence it is that singing has always had a most important place in public religious worship. It was so under the old dispensation. It is emphatically so under the new.

The Hebrews were a musical people. Almost the first we hear of them, as a nation, is in that outburst of inspired song, the most sublime on record, as they stood in the early dawn, on the shores of the Red Sea, in whose still troubled and tumultuous waters, the host of Pharaoh, with his horses and char-

lots, had sunk as a stone. It was to them the birthday of freedom, and well might they exult and sing. The night before they were a nation of slaves. The morning light brought to them liberty;—liberty to them and destruction to their late task-masters. The singing of this song implies some degree of musical culture among the people. The ode was written undoubtedly by Moses, but it was sung by the whole congregation of Israel. Let us imagine for a moment the grandeur of the scene, and the musical effect of this immense multitude, three millions of people, men, women and children, all joining with one voice in the mighty chorus, as led by Miriam, "Sing unto the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea."

In the haste of their departure from Egypt, the children of Israel did not forget to take their musical instruments with them, and they continued to sing even in "the great and terrible wilderness." Their singing, alas! was not always in praise of Jehovah. When Moses came down from the mount of God with Joshua, they heard a noise in the camp. Joshua thought it was the "noise of war." But Moses said, "It is not the voice of them that shout for mastery, neither is it the voice of them that cry for being overcome, but the voice of them that sing do I hear." Afterward, when Moses gave them water, he taught them "the song of the well." "Spring up, O well, sing ye unto it."

And when they were established in the land which God promised to give them, they still continued to be a music loving people. They celebrated their victories over the Canaanites with timbrels and dances. The song of Deborah and Barak is one of the most spirited of martial odes. They sung in their homes also, and taught their children to sing. Subsequently, God gave them a king, "a man after his own heart," and who was he? It was David, "the sweet singer of Israel,"—David, who wrote so many of the Psalms, through which the church in all ages since have poured their aspirations and desires, their hopes and fears, all their emotions whether of joy or sorrow, into the bosom of God; and which are as beautifully appropriate and well suited to express the spiritual wants, the joys

and griefs of sanctified souls to-day, as when they were first penned. Many of the Psalms of David were composed for use in the service of the Tabernacle, and were there sung with an accompaniment of musical instruments. The most liberal provision was made, both by David and Solomon, for this part of religious worship. Out of thirty eight thousand Levites, four thousand were selected and set apart as singers, or musical performers. These were divided into twenty four classes, under trained leaders, "two hundred four-score and eight" in number, "all that were cunning," "who were instructed in the songs of the Lord." These were the sons of Asaph, Heman and Jeduthan, the three chief musical directors, with their brethren. On state occasions, as at the dedication of the Temple, to which allusion has already been made, this whole musical force was combined, with an effect which can be better imagined than described. The Psalms of David were used also, by the Jews, more particularly, as they went up thrice every year to present themselves before the Lord at Jerusalem. They travelled in caravans, and beguiled the tediousness of the way by singing, as they moved slowly along, some of the songs of Zion. The Psalms used for this purpose were those from the one hundred and twentieth to the one hundred and thirty fourth inclusive, called Psalms of Degrees; and it is an interesting circumstance to remember in this connection, that our blessed Lord, when a lad of twelve years old, as afterward in the course of his life, went up thus to Jerusalem and doubtless joined in singing these same Psalms.

In their captivity the Hebrews carried with them their musical instruments and their love of song. They hung their harps upon the willows, "by the rivers of Babylon." There is no more touching plaint in the whole Bible, than the one hundred and thirty seventh Psalm. Their enemies required them to sing, but their answer was, "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?" On their return from captivity, when the foundation of the second temple was laid, they sung together by courses, in praising and giving thanks unto the Lord, "the priests in their apparel, with trumpets, and the Levites,

the sons of Asaph with cymbals, being set to praise the Lord, after the ordinance of the King of Israel."

As might have been expected, when Christianity was established, the service of song was transferred from the Jewish synagogue and temple to the Christian sanctuary. Our Lord sang a hymn with the disciples, after the institution of the Supper, the same night in which he was betrayed. This was the custom of the Jews in the celebration of the Passover. The Psalms, from the 113th to the 118th inclusive, were used for this purpose. And, after the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, the disciples "were continually in the temple praising and blessing God." In Acts iv. 24th to the 30th we have the first recorded Christian song.

Among the miraculous gifts conferred upon the early church was that of improvising psalms and hymns, as the occasion seemed to require. The Apostle Paul refers to this in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, and gives directions as to the exercise of the gift, in their church assemblies. Did Paul himself sing? We might infer that he did from what he says in the same connection: "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also; I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also." Undoubtedly the apostle could both pray and sing. And he exhorts others to sing. Writing to the Ephesians he says: "But be filled with the Spirit, speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your hearts unto the Lord." The grounds for this three-fold distinction are not obvious. By the Psalms we understand the Hebrew book of that name as contained in the Old Testament. These we know were used by the Jews and by the early Christians in their worship, as they continue to be used by Christians at the present day. For this purpose they are most admirably suited. "They are an anatomy of all parts of the soul, since there is no emotion of which one can be conscious that is not imaged here in a glass,"¹—an inspired liturgy for all time. The Hymns the apostle speaks of were undoubtedly metrical compositions from other sources, songs composed for special occasions; such as the

song of Moses at the Red Sea, the song of Deborah, the elegy of David on the death of Saul and Jonathan, the song of Hezekiah, and including, perhaps, those that were improvised by the church at the time. Properly speaking a hymn is a song of praise to God. Precisely what is meant by spiritual songs, or how these differed from hymns, it is impossible to say. They may have been odes—that is the literal meaning of the word—expressive of the different varieties and emotions of Christian experience. And hence the appropriateness of the term “spiritual” as applied to them;—songs in which the experience of individual Christians found musical expression, as distinguished from those which were designed as offerings of praise to God. We have many such in our hymn books at the present time.

The early Christians abounded in song, and they *all* sang in their church assemblies. This is the testimony of many of the church fathers, as cited by Dr. Coleman in his *Ancient and Primitive Christianity*. “It was the ancient custom, and is still, with us,” says Chrysostom, “for all to come together and unitedly join in the singing. The young and old, rich and poor, male and female, bond and free, all join in one song. All worldly distinctions here cease, and the whole congregation form one general chorus.”

But not only in their public religious assemblies did the early Christians sing. They sang with their children at home, in family worship and when engaged about their daily business. They sang in their social gatherings with Christian friends. “Songs dedicated to the praise of God,” says one, “formed their pastime in private and their favorite recreations at their family and friendly meetings.” Jerome, writing from his quiet retreat, says: “Here, rustic though we are, we are all Christians. Psalms alone break the pervading stillness. The ploughman is singing hallelujahs while he turns the furrow. The reaper solaces his toils with hymns. The vineyard dresser, as he prunes his vines, chants something from the strains of David. These are our songs, and such are the notes with which our life is vocal.”

The early Christians sang also in prison and at the stake. Death had no terrors for them. They died triumphant and re-

joicing,—their souls wafted home to God on wings of praise. They sang at the graves of their friends; not dolorous hymns to minor tunes, but songs of lofty cheer; for they “sorrowed not even as others which have no hope.” They believed in Jesus, as the Resurrection and the Life, and stayed their afflicted souls on him, in the assured hope that “if Jesus died and rose again, them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him.”

And what power there was in these psalms and hymns under such circumstances! They were far more effective than preaching. Augustine in his confessions testifies to this. “Oh how freely was I made to weep,” he says, “by these hymns and spiritual songs, transported by the voices of the congregation sweetly singing. The melody of their voices filled my ear, and divine truth was poured into my heart. Then burned the sacred flame of devotion in my soul, and gushing tears flowed from my eyes, as well they might.”

But how happened it, if such was, for centuries, the custom of the church, that the singing in church assemblies came to be performed by a few? Choir singing was introduced about the fourth century, through a decline in the piety of the church. Another cause, which contributed largely to this result, was the introduction and use of a more elaborate and ornate style of music, which the people could not sing. Afterwards the singing was monopolized by the priesthood and performed in an unknown tongue. For more than ten centuries the voice of the people was not heard in the service of song. Then Luther came—Luther with his great heart of love, and fondness for church music. He believed in the power of song and was himself an accomplished singer. Next to theology, he was wont to say, “I give the highest place and the greatest honor to music.” “The devil,” he says, “hates good music, because thereby men are made joyful; for he loveth nothing better than to make men unbelieving and cowardly, by means of melancholy and gloominess.” Luther would have music taught in schools. “I would not as much as look at a school-master,” he says, “who could not sing.” Music helped him to preach. It was, in fact, the most effective kind of preaching. “It gave peace and a

joyful mind." "Therefore the prophets have employed no art as they have music; inasmuch as they have put their theology, not into geometry, or arithmetic, or astronomy, but into music. Hence it cometh, that by teaching the truth in psalms and hymns, they have joined theology and music in close union." This was what Luther himself attempted to do, and with marvellous success. He looked about him to find those who could write hymns and tunes for the people. He himself composed not a few and published them. The people seized upon them with avidity, and sung them everywhere; "not only in the churches and schools, but also in the houses and workshops, in the streets and in the market places, in the barns and in the fields." "Three or four thousand singing together at a time" was "but a trifle." Luther's object in this was two-fold. He would restore to the people the long lost privilege of joining in the public worship of God, in their own tongue, and he would instil into their minds and hearts, through the hymns that were sung, a love for the doctrines of the Reformation. And this he accomplished. The people sang his hymns and embraced the Protestant theology.

From the Continent, "this infectious frenzy of sacred song," as Thomas Warton described it, passed over into England. The old choral mode of worship being condemned by the royal commission, appointed in the reign of Henry VIII. to reform the ecclesiastical law, was at once abandoned by the leading reformers for Congregational psalmody. Queen Elizabeth, it is true, with her hatred of Puritanism and prejudices in favor of the old religion, continued to patronize the cathedral music, but, as congregational singing was not prohibited, it speedily found its way into most of the churches. "The singing of psalms," says Bishop Jewel, "begun in one church in London, did quickly spread itself, not only through the city, but in the neighboring places; sometimes at Paul's Cross six thousand people singing together." Dr. Milner, in his *Life and Times of Dr. Watts*, cites as the first instance on record of congregational singing in England the following:

"On March 15th, 1550, Mr. Vernon, a Frenchman by birth, but a learned Protestant and parson of St. Martins, Sudgate, preached

at St. Paul's Cross, before the mayor and aldermen; and after sermon done, they all sung in common a psalm in metre, as it seems now was frequently done, the custom being brought to us from abroad by the exiles."

And how inspiring this mode of singing then was, may be inferred from what took place in the old Minster at York, during the siege of 1644, as described by one Thomas Mace, a musical editor of that time. He refers to the custom in that church, "which was, that always before the sermon, the whole congregation sang a psalm together with the quire and the organ." "This organ" he proceeds to say:

"When the psalm was set before sermon, being let out into all its fulness of stops, together with the quire, began the psalm. But when that vast concordant unity of the whole congregational chorus came, as I may say, thundering in, even so as it made the very ground shake under us; oh! the unutterable, ravishing, soul's delight! in the which I was so transported, and wrapt up in high contemplations, that there was no room left in my whole man, viz., body, soul and spirit, for anything below divine and heavenly raptures, nor could there possibly be anything to which that singing might be truly compared, except the right apprehension or conceiving of that glorious and miraculous quire, recorded in the Scriptures, at the dedication of the Temple."

The epithet, "psalm-singer" came indeed to be synonymous with "heretic." The Lollards of a former age were of this class, as their name indicates. And how much their influence was dreaded in papal England, we may learn from a remark of the primate to the king, "If we permit this heretic (Wickliffe) to appeal to the passions of the people, our destruction is inevitable. *We must silence these Lollards—these psalm-singers.*" The church owes to the Reformers of the sixteenth century a debt she can never repay, for rescuing the doctrines of salvation from the darkness of the Middle Ages and the corruptions of the Papacy; but the obligation is greatly enhanced by the fact that they restored to the people and to *all* the people, the privilege of joining in the high praises of God in the sanctuary.

It has often been noticed that an increased interest in hymns and singing always accompanies a revival of religion.

It was so in the revivals which took place in the early history of this country. Cotton Mather says: "It is remarkable, when the kingdom of God has been making any new appearance, a mighty zeal for the singing of psalms has attended it and assisted it." President Edwards notices the same in connection with the revival at Northampton, in 1734. "It has been observable," he says, "that there has been scarcely any part of divine worship, wherein good men amongst us have had grace so drawn forth, and their hearts so lifted up in the ways of God, as in singing his praises." And in his *Thoughts on the Revival of 1740*, he has a similar remark:—"I believe it to have been one fruit of the extraordinary degrees of the sweet and joyful influence of the Spirit of God, that there has appeared such a disposition to abound in this divine exercise, not only in their appointed solemn meetings, but when Christians occasionally meet together at each other's house." It was thought by some that this was carried too far—young converts would go through the streets, in company, on their way to and from meeting, singing hymns and psalms of praise to God. But Edwards justifies them in the practice. He thinks it not without scriptural warrant, and cites among other instances, the case of David, who "had gone with the multitude, who went with them to the house of God, with the voice of joy and praise, with a multitude that kept holy day." So far from seeing anything objectionable in it, he thinks, supposing "there was in other respects a proportionable appearance of fervency in devotion, it would be ravishingly beautiful if such things were practiced all over the land, and would have a great tendency to enliven, animate and rejoice the souls of God's saints, and greatly to propagate vital religion." "I believe," he adds, "the time is coming when the world will be full of such things." And so it will be, undoubtedly, in the Millennium.

There are hymns, indeed, so intense and fervid in their expression, they can be sung only in revivals. We instinctively pass over them, and, perhaps, are disposed to criticise and find fault with them in times of coldness and spiritual declension. But let the Spirit come from on high, and fire the hearts of Christians with love to God and zeal in his cause, and then

these intense and glowing hymns are selected as the most fitting vehicle for the expression of emotions that burn and glow within. So, too, there are "revival melodies," as they are called, tunes which we sing in a quickened state of religious feeling, tunes which at any other time would be "as vinegar upon nitre." These I know are condemned by musical critics and amateurs, but the church *will* sing them. "The state of feeling is such that it swells beyond the shackles of musical authority, and that music is sought for and employed which is known to produce *effects*." "There are tunes which are now sung in prayer meetings which have, in this way, outlived whole generations of what is called scientific music."¹ And what power these hymns and tunes have in increasing and extending religious interest? Who has not felt this? We say with Watts:

"Lord, how delightful 'tis to see
A whole assembly worship thee."

All seem to sing in revivals of religion, even those who have not been accustomed to sing before. And hence Spurgeon has remarked, "Congregational singing and united prayer always accompany a revival."

"I have been there and still would go,
'Tis like the dawn of heaven below."

And it is the dawn of heaven below, for we never get so near heaven as when lifted on the waves of song, in a revival of religion.

If singing then is worship, why should not all, so far as they may, participate in it? But all do not join in public prayer. In prayer, as a general thing this would be impracticable. One must lead, and the attempt on the part of the congregation to unite with him in an audible voice, unless a prescribed form of prayer were used, would produce only confusion and noise. But with singing it is different. The laws of harmony are such that the whole congregation, young and old, male and female, may unite in this service, keeping perfect time and tune; and the greater the number and variety of voices, the greater the musical effect. Who has not observed this, at some anniver-

¹ Joshua Leavitt.

sary meeting or Christian convention, when a familiar hymn and tune are given out and the whole congregation burst into song; the volume of sound rising and swelling, until the impulse to sing becomes almost irresistible, and the whole house seems to sway and rock with melody.

But is there sufficient musical talent and culture, in congregations generally, to warrant this? Not perhaps, if they were left entirely to themselves. The services of the choir are not to be dispensed with. But with the help and under the leadership of a well-trained choir, any of our congregations may sing a sufficient variety of tunes for all the purposes of Christian worship. There are oftentimes as fine voices, persons with as much musical taste and culture, in the congregation as in the choir. Not all singers are invited to join the choir, or, if invited, choose to accept the invitation. Some prefer to worship below with the family to which they belong. And we can not complain of this. But we want the help of their voices in this part of divine worship. Some pains must, indeed, be taken to instruct the congregation in sacred music. There must be singing schools and congregational rehearsals from time to time. All will not attend, but enough will be present to prepare for the worship of the Sabbath. The children—and here is our main hope—will soon catch the tunes they are accustomed to hear and become in time practiced singers. When the present generation shall have passed away congregational singing will be the rule and choir singing the exception.

But the choir, we have said, is not to be dispensed with. Some will differ from us here, preferring a precentor. How it would be if the whole congregation were able to sing, it is impossible to say; though, even in that case, we can see an advantage in having a select body of well-trained, accomplished singers, who would meet often for practice and be the leaders and educators of the congregation in this part of divine service. But the musical culture of the people has been sadly neglected, and that for many generations. It is not until quite recently that singing has been introduced into our public schools, and it is not yet introduced, as it seems to us it should be, into them all. The consequence is, singers are rare and widely scattered

in our congregations. Some can sing a little, but have no confidence in themselves as independent singers. These need the support which a choir would give, and all would sing with more heartiness and joy, with such help. A choir will be serviceable also in learning and practising new tunes. Such tunes must from time to time be introduced, though as a general rule the old are better.

It is desirable, of course, that the good will and co-operation of the choir should be secured, if possible. Much depends upon the stand they take. If they are opposed to the movement and refuse to sing with the congregation, then a precentor must be obtained, and other singers introduced or trained up. Some parts of the service might be performed by the choir alone. This would serve to keep up their interest and be an inducement for them to meet for practice. Perhaps the best arrangement that could be made, at present, would be to have congregational singing at the opening and closing of each service, with a chant or anthem from the choir before sermon. It is easy to see how it would be somewhat trying for cultivated singers to sing with beginners or with those who sing but seldom. The subject should be viewed, however, not as a matter of feeling but in the light of a Christian duty. The ability to sing is a talent or gift, one of the choicest and best which God has bestowed upon his creatures. The man or woman who can sing is to use this talent in the service of God and in such way as will best promote his glory. It may be easier, more gratifying to personal tastes and the pride of the natural heart, to sing alone, or with a few well-trained voices; but what do the services of the sanctuary demand? and what will be most pleasing to God? If the choir is composed of reasonable, Christian men and women, they may be made to see this in the light in which it has now been presented. If not, perhaps their services in the worship of God may as well be dispensed with. But if all attempt to sing, those who can and those who can not, the result will be anything but pleasing. No one of course should presume to sing, in public, who has not sufficient knowledge of the art to sing so that others may sing with him. Some persons have no ear for music. Others have harsh

voices. These, perhaps, must be content to sing as the apostle suggests,—“singing and making melody *in your hearts* unto the Lord.” But rude and uncultivated voices even may be made to blend so as to assist in congregational singing. Some organs have, we have been told, what is called a “wolf stop,” a pipe which produces most inharmonious sounds, but which are overborne by the music of the other stops, and so made to swell the general harmony. We would not care to hear the “wolf stop” alone, but with a sufficient volume of musical sound, we can understand how grand the effect may be. A poor singer may thus venture to sing with the congregation, *if he does not attempt to lead*. No one will hear the discordant sounds he makes but himself, and he is not likely to be troubled by them. This is the advantage of the organ which, if skillfully handled, may be made to cover up, with its full diapason, the defects and discords of untrained voices; while it encourages and supports those who can sing, but are distrustful of their own powers, bearing them along, as it were, on the swelling tide of its harmonies. Let all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ and pray for the coming of his kingdom, encourage the introduction of congregational singing; that so the church on earth may be prepared to unite in

“That undisturbed song of pure consent,
Aye sung before the sapphire-colored throne,
To him that sits thereon;
With saintly shout and solemn jubilee;
When the bright seraphim, in burning row,
Their loud, uplifted, angel-trumpets blow;
And the cherubic host, in thousand choirs,
Touch their immortal harps of golden wires;
With those just spirits, that wear victorious palms,
Hymns devout, and holy psalms
Singing everlastingly.”

ARTICLE VII.

THE ARABIAN DESERT.—PART I.

ARABIA is situated in the southwest part of Asia, and is a peninsula enclosed mainly by the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf, and extends northward to the borders of Syria and Palestine. With an area of about a million square miles it is occupied by twelve millions of inhabitants. One conceives of it as the region where coffee and nutmegs grow, and as redolent of the fragrance of spices and aromatics, frankincense and myrrh. Poets have been our geographers; and it has become the realm of pearls and amber, of the "sorrowing sea-bird" and "Peris of ocean." On grandest epic authority, it is an abundant source of rich perfumes, whence passing gales diffuse the sweet effluence wide around:

"to them who sail
Beyond the Cape of Hope, and now are past
Mozambic, off at sea North East winds blow
Sabeian odors from the spicy shores
Of Araby the blest; . . . And many a league,
Cheer'd with the grateful smell, old Ocean smiles."

Still it is known that the greater part of the country presents a striking contrast to the charms of Araby the blest. From the hills and groves of Yemen and the waters of Oman, sandy deserts, varied only with ridges of rocky mountains, extend far into the interior. The boundless level, destitute of shade, is swept by stifling simooms and scorched by the rays of a tropical sun. Rivers appear only after great rains, and then, absorbed by the thirsty earth, often fail to reach the sea. The aspect is one of utter and limitless desolation.

A gift of heaven, remarkably adapted to this region, is the camel, without which, as "the ship of the desert," these wastes could only with greatest difficulty be crossed. Arabia, also, is the native country of the horse, where, reared among the children almost as a member of the family, he appears docile in spirit yet fleet as the wind.

The inhabitants are genuine Arabs, descendants of Ishmael, herdsmen and husbandmen of patriarchal simplicity. By foreigners they are called Saracens, but by themselves Bedawîn. They are fond of poetry and eloquence, and are brave and warlike, cherishing a passionate love of liberty and independence. They practice robbery also, yet never in violation of the laws of hospitality.

Here Mahommed arose, the teacher and legislator, who gave to the people religion and law, inaugurated the brightest era of Arabic culture, afterwards supported by the rival schools of Bagdad and Cordova, and founded a military and religious sway extending from India to the shores of the Atlantic.

It would have been interesting to study the methods and results of the Arabian civilization as developed at Cairo, so long the centre of the Saracen power in Egypt. There is the mosque of El-Azhar, regarded as the university, not only of Egypt, but of the whole East. It early acquired celebrity for its learned teachers in theology and Mussulman law, and at the present day students are drawn thither from all parts of the Mussulman world. Such, however, is the atmosphere of fanaticism surrounding this university, that an infidel stranger, it is said, would involve himself in serious danger by appearing there. We visited several of the oldest mosques with deep interest—that of Amrou in old Cairo, and the mosque of Touloun, built on the plan of the Caaba of Mecca; and also some of the more recent, the mosque of Sultan Hassan, and that commenced by Mohammed Ali at the citadel, the former the most beautiful, the latter the most costly of the city. These consist of large, square courts (each open above and having a fountain in the centre for purposes of ablution), surrounded by colonades forming deep covered galleries, where the people assemble for worship. On one side is the place of prayer, and the teacher's pulpit. From the angles minarets rise, from which the muezzin calls the faithful to prayer. We were greatly favored with the opportunity of witnessing the departure (February 25th) of the annual caravan of pilgrims from Egypt for Mecca. This, more than anything else, gave us evidence of the vigor still remaining in the Mussulman faith. Still, with the lapse of the

centuries, and the dilapidation so generally apparent in the mosques, the literature, science, and culture of the people would seem to have greatly declined.

The city itself was odd and interesting. We were quartered on the west side of the Esbekyeh, the grand park and promenade; and from the windows of the Hotel de l'Orient, viewed the strange crowd continually moving by, and watched the frequent bridal processions passing with music and other tokens of joy. We went to the bazaars and business streets, and saw rows of grave, turbaned traders, with their pipes, sitting on either side, cross legged amongst their goods, the products of every Oriental clime; the narrow, unpaved passage-ways filled with countless people, Fellâhs and Bedawin, Copts, Greeks and Jews, Turks and Franks, with visages of every shade from the ebony of Soudan to the clear-faced Berberîn; caravans arriving from the different parts of Africa and Arabia; camels slow and solemn, donkeys mounted with scantily-clothed Arabs, with fully-veiled women astride, and with eager Yankees, the brisk little animals followed by boys, with stick and voice propelling them through the crowd, like the screw the steamer through the ocean waters. The scene was noisy, confused, and to my eyes fantastical to the last degree, yet of course it had an order and method of its own. We went, also, through long, narrow streets bordered by houses of stone below and brick above, the successive stories projecting over those beneath, so that from the latticed windows, the neighbors could join hands from the opposite sides. Light from the skies was almost shut out at mid-day, and the effect was gloomy, sometimes like that of passing through a tunnel. The courts and fountains, the foliage and luxury were within. The apartments and gardens are said to be often spacious and magnificent, and Cairo is pronounced to be, after Constantinople, the largest and most beautiful city of the Mussulman East. Western influences have not yet taken from it its purely Saracen character.

We had engaged our dragoman for the desert, before the excursion up the Nile. He was an Arab, a native of Beyrout, who spoke, besides his vernacular, the English, French and Italian languages with tolerable fluency and correctness. He had

contracted to furnish camels, attendants, tents, food and all things needful for a party of six gentlemen, and to take us through the Bedawîn tribes of the desert to Mount Sinai and Palestine, thence to Damascus and Baalbec, and finally to Beyrout. The time assigned for the journey was some seventy days, and the compensation to be rendered was nine pounds sterling per day for the party, we to have full control of the journey, the places to be visited, the routes to be taken and the times of stopping.

The camels and supplies having been inspected and sent on in advance, to go around the head of the Red Sea, we left by rail on the first day of March, to join the animals and make up our little caravan. From the centre of the great belt of verdure bordering the Nile, the railroad first takes a north easterly direction obliquely out of the green, and then an easterly course to the Isthmus of Suez. We passed the gardens through which we had previously rode to Heliopolis, the On of the Scripture, and that place itself, so interestingly associated with the history of Joseph, who, as a young man, is so justly regarded the Adonis of the East. We passed also the traditional place, where Mary, the mother of Jesus, and Joseph are said to have stopped, when with the holy child they fled to Egypt from the wrath of King Herod. For a time in our course all was green and beautiful, but as we proceeded, the foliage gradually became less luxuriant. Soon there appeared what seemed to be peninsulas of verdure with bays of sand making up behind them. Then, on the right side and the left, we beheld a vast ocean of sand; the desert extended everywhere to the horizon. A range of black and purplish mountains in a short time rose to view on the south, till at length passing them on the north, we came down on the Gulf of Suez. On this route of a hundred and twenty miles, there are two rail road stations, decorated with green, and furnishing a few material supplies for travellers, but all besides is an expanse of sand and gravel, not loose and drifting, but hard, compacted and apparently boundless.

Suez, chiefly an Arab village of twelve or fifteen hundred people, is insignificant and uninteresting in itself, but it has a

mighty reminiscence ; and is important as located at a main point of transit for the products of the Eastern and Western worlds. English and French enterprise has imparted the life it possesses. Whether the great Lesseps canal, proposing to unite the Red Sea with the Mediterranean for the purposes of ship commerce, will prove a successful enterprise is not yet decided. The work is in vigorous progress. Suez has undying celebrity for the emancipation of the Israelites from slavery and their national independence achieved here. Here the military power of Egypt was vanquished, its king destroyed and a nation of two millions and a half advanced to liberty. We crossed the arm of the sea in a boat with good Arab rowers, passed up the eastern bank and stood on the shore of deliverance.

In regard to the exact place of Israel's crossing, the opinions of critical investigators are divided between the locality at Suez, now considerably changed by the drifting in of the sand for ages, and another, a few miles farther down the Gulf, at the opening of Wady Tawârîk, through the hills where a wider reach of sea must have been crossed. The main objection urged against the latter place is the difficulty of so large a company passing over the space of eight or ten miles, in a night. Doubtless the difficulty of crossing at either place must have been great, and at the latter, greater than at the former. But Jehovah's power was also great, and was exerted, and limited only by the dictates of his wisdom and love. His plan was declared to be to make himself known ; to assert his power, truth and love to Israel, Egypt and the rest of the world ; and if crossing eight miles of sea in twelve hours, would in his view, accomplish this end more effectually than to cross four, or two miles in that time, he could find ways and means to achieve it. If the Lord could trouble the Egyptian hosts and take off their chariot wheels, so that they drave them heavily, he could also encourage the escaping crowd in their flight, and to their speed lend wings. Here would seem to be the true Horatian "*dignus vindice nodus*," an exigency demanding the conspicuous interposition of the Almighty. And it is difficult to see why a capable miracle in manifestation of the grandeur and power of Jehovah would not be as rational as the least possible energy

he could exert and get the frightened fugitives up the eastern slope of the Gulf. Standing on the Arabian shore at the sites above and below, and considering the various forces, Israelitish, Egyptian and Supernal, in action there, I saw no reason why the people should not have crossed below, at the point nearest the wells of Moses. Still, doubtless, they may have crossed above; and whether it were above or below, *there* substantially the grand event transpired. Forth from these waters they came in triumph. Upon this broad, hard plain, the panting hosts stood, and breathed freely again after the hot pursuit. Here with the bodies of the cruel foe floating in the waves before them and strewed dead along the shore, they lifted up the song of triumph, the voices of men, women and children joining in choral and responsive strains: "I will sing unto the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously. The horse and his rider he hath cast into the sea."

It was elevating to stand at such a point and take in the spirit of the scene. I read again the narrative and recalled the entire series of events that culminated here, and could not fail to recognize it as one of the grand historic places of the world. The details as given were of peculiar interest, the fright of the fugitive host when the Egyptian army came upon them, the complete *cul de sac*, into which they were driven, the regretful looking back of the people towards Egypt, Moses standing in God's great power and calling on his name, the pillar of cloud changing from front to rear as a separating guard, and the order to go forward; the sea miraculously opening and the waters standing on either side as a wall, the immense train moving onward, the foe in pursuit, entering the wonderful pathway, an order from Moses' lips and the return of the sea in its strength; the utter destruction of the enemy and the song of triumph from the enfranchised millions on the desolate, but friendly shore. This very sea before me was God's instrument in the grand act of national justice, those heavens and that range of purple hills beheld the transaction, and on this strand the singers struck the cymbal and shouted forth the song of victory.

We mounted our camels, took the pathway of the Israelites

in leaving the sea, and in a couple of hours, reached Ayûn Mûsa, the wells of Moses. Except two or three low trees, not a green thing appeared on the way. The slow and solemn camels moved over a pathway of desolation. The plain extended everywhere level with the horizon, the steel-blue sea stretched away on the right, the skies bent cloudlessly above. Occupied in thought, we rode on in silence. By and by the stars came out, dim at the horizon but clear above. The camp lights soon glimmered in the distance. The palm tree, the orange, the acacia appeared. Our tents were soon in order, dinner followed, and filled with excitement, yet in safety and peace, I gave myself up, with dear friends far away, to the Great Protector, and passed my first night in camp, where the children of Israel probably spent the first night after their joyful deliverance.

The next morning found us up betimes, and eager for the journey. Mounting our camels, we rode that day eight hours. We passed over hard sand plains, now smooth as a floor, and now covered with small stones and flint globules. All the vegetation I saw during the day was a tuft of shrubs covering a small knoll of sand, three stunted trees, a single six-leaved plant and an occasional yellow flower. The next day, of eight hours' ride, furnished only variations of desolation; first, a hard, yellow plain, with a reach of the sea on the right and purple mountains beyond, and on the left, limestone hills of the Râhah range, a bright sun, and fine, bracing air; next, varieties of stony plains; next an amphitheatre of hills enclosing us around, and then broken elevations and reaches of sand. When the desolation was most nearly complete, we had reached the vicinity of Ain Hawârah, the Marah of the Bible. Three of the party went at once to see the waters. Joseph, the dragoman, insisted that an armed Bedawy should accompany us, on account of danger, from bad Arabs, solemnly asseverating that they might rob and shoot us, bury us in the sand and we be never heard of more.

Proceeding a mile and a half through broken hills and a desolate avenue, we came upon a spring of clear water under the edge of a shelving rock. It was five or six feet long, and perhaps a foot deep. The water had a peculiarly unpleasant taste.

Pointing the Arab guard first to the spring and then to my mouth, to inquire about drinking, with a vehement gesture of aversion, he cried out in Arabic "mürr" "mürr" "bitter" "bitter." The water is used only for purposes of washing. There is but a single spring, with deposits of calcarious substance about it. Near by, there is a clump of wild palm trees with shrubs around. A thorny, acidulous shrub (called ghürkü'd) grows near, which some have considered the tree Moses cast into the waters to sweeten them, but the whole desert does not produce enough of the shrub to effect this purpose for the supply of the millions.

The next morning we left Marah and came to Elim, (Wady Ghürundel), where the children of Israel found "twelve fountains of water and three score and ten palm trees," and pitched their tents. We found two wells dug in the valley four or five feet deep. Others might easily be dug around; and farther down the valley, we were told, the waters came to the surface of the sand. There were growing around, wild palm trees and numerous shrubs, the tamarisk tree with feathery leaf, and the acacia, the tree of the burning bush, which supplied the wood also for the ark and the tabernacle.

On the forenoon of this day, we entered on a succession of amphitheatre-like formations having hard floors, and hills rising with regularity on all sides, the axes of the structures generally crossing our pathway, but sometimes in line with it. This style of formation became more pronounced the farther we advanced, constantly reminding one of the Coliseum at Rome, only the dimensions were far greater and the effect often almost overpowering. On our way to Wady Taiyibeh, the mountains rose bold on the right, presenting massive limestone walls, in some places temple-formed and inexpressibly grand, while on the left stood lofty ridges, peaks, domes and pyramids of darker colored rock. If, like the children of Israel, we are coming into the presence of the God of the whole earth, I said to myself, this surely, is worthy to be the grand *dromos* leading to the portal of his holy temple.

Having passed the night here, early the next morning we rode for an hour between tall limestone cliffs laid up in white,

on one side, and black calcined strata resting on white, on the other, when suddenly the sea burst on our view. How delightfully this appeared, it is impossible to describe. With what emotions the Israelites must have been filled when they came hither and "encamped by the sea"! Though their enemy, it had given them protection and triumph. They had passed through it, under the guidance of their Maker. Homeless wanderers over "the great and terrible wilderness," God's pillar of cloud and fire had led them back to it again. Here they saw once more the blue waters, the coast-line beyond and the hills of Egypt, from the borders of which they had been expelled. How incomprehensible to some hearts among them must have been the plans of God, and their situation here! An occasional palm tree now sends up its feathery tuft, and tamarisks abound, the valley widens as you pass down, and with the sloping shores there is ample room for the encampment of an army.

We here passed the bluffs of Zelima, at high water beaten by the tide, and then crossed the sandy plain of Murkah. Mountains of diverse colors rose in columnar and majestic forms on the one side, and the blue sea with crested waves plashed on the other. I lingered awhile behind to gather shells and colored stones on the shore, but was soon summoned to take the long pathway of alternate marble and sand, and then to enter the mountain-gate of Wady Shalâl.

Penetrating into the interior, we now went up a majestic avenue amidst massive mountain forms of wonderful coloring, stretching away in long perspective, peak beyond peak, into the distant clouds. We ascended the rocky stair-case of Nubk Bâdereh, visited the copper mines wrought by the ancient Egyptians, passed through "the written valley," where are found the celebrated Sinaitic inscriptions, and after a ride of great fatigue, came to camp in a stupendous ellipse in the Wady Teirâm. While the younger members of the party were trading with the Bedawîn for turquoises, I wandered forth and viewed the mountains cutting the skies with sharp outline on every side, the peaks behind, peering above them in sunset softness. Massive hills arose within as if supporting with their

pyramidal forms the large wall structures, and although destitute of vegetation, all were colored with wonderful varieties of green, red, brown and yellow. As I viewed these magnificent forms in the clear evening air, and remembered that Jehovah's pillar of fire once illumined these pinnaced towers and the hosts of Israel encamped here by night, I could not but wonder and adore.

Four hours further brought us to the ruins of the city Feriân, the Paran of Moses and Habbakuk. In approaching it, the tamarisk tree appeared in fuller development; then came palm trees and acacias, and the dandelion, with several kinds of familiar grasses. On the left, perpendicular cliffs ascend against the sky with dykes of dark porphyry, like huge columns, rising from the bottom to the top. On the right, mountains of rock rise buttressed and firm, with the shafts of Mount Serbâl peering above them in sublime majesty. It seems as if, by some great convulsion, the roof had been torn off and, as in the grand ruin of Karnak, the temple laid bare to the eye of the sun. The pillared hall extends for a long distance up the valley, till the vista is closed to the eye by hills seemingly innumerable, ranging away towards Mount Sinai. No words can adequately describe this wonderful inclosure.

It well corresponds with our conceptions of the Most High, that places like these should be appointed for his manifestation to mankind. With lofty thought, the prophet writes:

“God came from Teman,
And the Holy One from Mount Paran.
His glory covered the heavens,
And the earth was full of his praise. . . .
He stood and measured the earth;
He beheld and drove asunder the nations;
And the everlasting mountains were scattered;
The perpetual hills did bow.”

When monasticism had arisen in the church, thousands of hermits dwelt here. Along the rocky surface small apertures are still visible reaching to their cells, and a bishop once resided here, to whose jurisdiction the monasteries around Mounts Serbâl and Sinai were subject. Here are palm trees and gardens kept by the Bedawîn, and a rivulet of pure water runs through

the valley, in its sandy bed. To the eye of the wearied traveller, after passing through constant sands and rocks, these are unspeakably refreshing. The ruins, however, of the ancient city, perched on the hill-sides, without an inhabitant, speak to him only of desolation. Proceeding up the Wady Solâf, we called at the encampment of the Arab Sheikh, by whose safe conduct we were passing through the country, and received his courteous hospitality; after which, at the head of the valley, we encamped for the night.

In the morning as the sun kissed the hill-tops and led forth the illumination of the day, it was superbly beautiful. We advanced toward Horeb, not by the Wady esh-Sheikh, the circuitous route pursued by the children of Israel, but by Nukb Hâwy, a difficult pass through a mountain defile, penetrating the outer walls and leading into the recesses of Sinai. Dismounting from our camels, we and they toiled up the weary ascent for the space of an hour, the jagged rocks rising on both sides a thousand feet above our heads, and disjointed blocks of granite and piles of *débris* every where obstructing the path. At the top of the pass, we emerged on a gradually opening, yet ascending valley sprinkled with shrubs. Passing through this, the mountains separated and a long plain opened before us. Remounting our camels, and advancing to the water-shed, the situation broke fully upon us. We were inclosed in the most majestic of all the mountain structures we had yet seen. The others, indeed, would seem to have been but preparatory to this. Behind, the pinnacled shafts of the mountain walls through which we had approached arose, piercing the clear sky. On the right and left, two or three hundred yards apart, huge, rocky towers were reared, a thousand or more feet high, with turreted ridges running along nearly parallel, and connecting with other mountain masses in advance. Beyond these, two valleys came in on opposite sides through high, rocky walls, forming the mighty transepts of this stupendous temple; while at the further end, simple and sublime, arose Horeb, the mountain of the Law. It stands in the middle of the fourth side of the quadrangle, the most conspicuous form of the group. The central mass of granite rises boldly twelve or fifteen hundred

feet in perpendicular height. It is buttressed solidly below, and seamed with furrows from bottom to top, so as greatly to heighten the aspect of immovable grandeur, and flanked, on the right and left, with rocky masses extending off in either direction. Here, Jehovah revealed himself to his ancient people, assembled in audience on the plain below. Filled with awe, we passed along towards the mount for the space of a mile, till, turning off at the south-east corner of the plain, we followed up a valley coming in at that point, and sought rest and refreshment in the Greek convent of Mount Sinai.

ARTICLE VIII.

PECULIAR TEMPTATIONS NO EXCUSE.

A SHORT SERMON.

"All the saints salute you ; chiefly, they that are of Cæsar's household."
—*Philippians* iv. 22.

CÆSAR'S household! The last place in the world where you would expect to find a saint was under the roof of Nero. Yet we have here the word of one who knew the saintly character well, and dwelt hard by the residence of those here named, that there were real saints in the household of this imperial monster.

How many people think they could live aright, if only they could get away from their present surroundings, far from the sweep of their peculiar temptations, out of Cæsar's household. The school boy among dishonest or bullying mates, the officer in command of a vicious and turbulent crew, the importer, or manufacturer, among competitors that undersell him by evading the revenue laws, or other kinds of cheaterly, say, "you don't know how peculiarly we are situated; you can't live here and be a Christian."

Then you must not live there. Lot has no right to settle in Sodom if it is to make him a Sodomite. Cæsar has a right to have a household, but Satan has not.

But then, if *you* claim a right to be in Cæsar's household, *God*

claims a right to have a saint there. What is a saint? One who renders "unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." May not *that* be fairly claimed even of those "most peculiarly situated."

Yet again, you *must* be in Cæsar's household somewhere. It is world-wide. Everybody is an employee in one way or another. Cæsar goes by many *aliases*. The different departments of his household call him variously, The World, My Business, Our Party, Society, Fashion, My Daily Bread, and so on. Hence the uneasy ones would only be changing rooms, not roofs. Every one is in danger of mixing up God's things and Cæsar's things, and rendering to Cæsar what belongs to God.

And once more: A man's peculiar temptations are simply the notification to him of God's peculiar claims, and his own peculiar wants. The place where a man is peculiarly tempted to drift with the ungodly current, is just the place where God has peculiar need of a steadfast witness for the truth. It is a maxim of the trading world that "demand creates supply." It is meant to. So when God wants in us, or—what is the same thing—when we want a virtue, a degree of virtue that is not in us, we find ourselves put in situations that call it out. This is the divine mode of education, God's drawing forth of the moral and spiritual powers. Let us not think it any hardship, then, to have urgent demands made upon us for honesty, patience, charity, or faith in God. So our Master has taught us in saying, "I pray, not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil." In the world, just as bad as it is, but above the world's evil, must be the Christian life.

1. Because Cæsar's household needs saints in it. Not those sorts business that are essentially immoral, but those that have a right to exist, are now referred to. Just as the carpenter's trade, in the wicked antediluvian world, needed "a Noah to be a preacher of righteousness," every legitimate occupation needs faithful Christian men in it, to diffuse the leaven, the salt, the light of manly piety. Take an extreme case, the profession of a soldier. The Peace Society to the contrary, there must be standing armies, in order that the millennium may come. A police force is a standing army. Grace can grow in camps and warfare, we know from the centurions in the New Testament, from the lives of such men as Havelock, and Vicars, and our own General Howard. The motley crowd in the fort, or ship, must corrupt, if the salt be not mixed in. It is for lack of saints that

armies are what they are. A blessing, then, on those that bear witness for Christ where witnesses are fewest!

But when we look through modern society, we feel that "saints in Cæsar's household" expresses the universal need. In legislative assemblies, the seductions of the lobby or the bribes of the executive; in our elections, the blindness of party spirit and the reckless strife for place: in business life, the haste to be rich, the fever of speculation, the growing propensity to gamble (and that even in the prime necessities of life, to the distress of the poor by the consequent unnatural disturbance of prices), a recognition of conventional rules of honesty which legitimates rascality,—make us cry out for more Christian men in Congress, State Legislatures, Municipal Councils, in our counting rooms, on 'change, at the polls, who shall be saints in Cæsar's household, putting to shame, putting out this lust of "filthy lucre," that would put soul and country both upon the auction block for a bargain. We need them in our Sabbath breaking railroad corporations, where the Christian stockholders who pocket the profits of Sabbath work are responsible for the same, till they have done all they can do to prevent it. We need them in our summer resorts, by the sea-side and hill-side, where are found in the gay crowd too many who seem to have left Bible and Covenant at home. We need them in here and there a church, where Christ's great law of sacrifice is practically denied, and worldliness, selfishness or strife betokens Cæsar's household, rather than a household of faith.

II. Because saints need the discipline of Cæsar's household. "My soul is among lions!" groaned St. David at one time. But it was a good thing for him. He grew a saint with thews and sinews, a lion-tamer, a lion-conqueror. God ordains *praise "out of the mouths of babes and sucklings," as it is written. But he wants them to grow out of babyhood into manhood, so as to do man's work for him. And so they need training, to be had in Cæsar's household only. For sainthood radically consists in the preference of God to the world. And when the world's highest bids are offered, where the world's lustiest temptations wrestle, where all that this world can offer is most temptingly displayed, to make good the confession "There is none upon earth that I desire beside THEE," this makes the manly saint. And if sainthood can only in Cæsar's household attain to manhood, it needs the drill it gets there to make it independent, modest, firm, looking more to God than to majorities, more to his law than custom or fashion, more to eternity, than temporary profits or mortal judgments, yet in all this, rendering duly unto Cæsar the

things that are Cæsar's rightly. It needs also to see what it sees there to keep it humble, considering itself lest it also be tempted. There it sees the emptiness and instability of a morality that has no root in God. There it learns to fear, lest its own fall should newly point the scoffing adage, "every man has his price." There it learns to abide in him whose grace alone can keep from falling.

Finally: We may neither court trial, nor shrink out of it when God has put us in. It was a grievous mistake when Christians began to think that the only place for a saint was a convent, or a hermitage. We are taught to pray, "Lead us not into temptation;" but we are also assured, "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation."

Great battles are glorious in the annals of the victors; great sieges, like those of Leyden and Londonderry, still more so. The grandest displays of martial genius and prowess for a few hours, are outshone by the glow of prudence, constancy, and courage for weeks and months together, while heroes not only beat back the assault in the deadly breach, but outwear the slow grinding of hunger, watching, sickness and deferred hope, until the glad day that brings relief.

It is the slow trial of siege, rather than the quick trial of battle, that the saint in Cæsar's household is called to endure. "Behold," saith the Apostle, "we count them happy which endure."

ARTICLE IX.

LITERARY NOTICES.

- 1.—*The Atonement.* By Rev. ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER HODGE, D. D., Professor of Didactic, Historical and Polemical Theology in the Western Theological Seminary, at Allegheny, Pa. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 440.

It is significant that this volume should be put forth by the Presbyterian Board of Publication before the echo of the great Presbyterian Union Meeting had ceased to reverberate. The only possible basis of union for the two General Assemblies is a liberal interpretation of the Westminster Confession, to which both bodies have professed to adhere. But the preface declares that this book is put

forth in "vindication of the ancient faith of the Presbyterian Church and of the unquestionable and only legitimate interpretation of her standards."

Accordingly the Hopkinsian, or Governmental theory of Jenkins, Beman, Barnes, Fiske and others, is opposed with great force; as also the Moral Influence theory of Young, Bushnell, etc. The Satisfaction theory is clearly set forth, powerfully advocated, making Christ's work of the propitiation of God real, and not metaphysical. All this we were prepared for; but that the Limited Atonement theory, or what the author calls "the definite and personal redemption" plan should also be so stoutly insisted on, and be so mixed with the whole "Satisfaction" scheme, and at such a time as this, astonishes us. It is a source of great weakness, and most unfortunate. It is "the feet of clay," which will crumble and bring down even "the head of gold." How very weak is the chain forged on this wise.

"It certainly follows that . . . the design and effect of Christ's peculiar sacrifice of himself . . . must have been to secure with certainty the actual remission of the sins of all those for whom he died. And it follows that Christ must make intercession for all those for whom he made expiation. But Christ's intercession is always efficacious. It is offered from a throne at the right hand of his Father. His formula of intercession is 'Father I will.' His testimony is that the 'Father heareth him always.' And he intercedes only for his 'own people.' John xvii. 9. '*I pray not for the world, but for them which THOU HAST GIVEN ME.*'"

Prayer is desire; and we should be sorry enough to believe that Christ had no desire for the salvation of the world, though at that particular time; John xvii, it is true enough that Christ did pray only for his people. How strange it is that, even at this day, the Presbyterian Old School men will not separate the Divine *purpose* from the Divine *provision* of salvation. It only confirms the view now generally taken by Congregationalists, that our Old School Congregational young men must go to Hartford and not to Princeton, nor Allegheny; and that the Hartford Seminary must be fostered and thoroughly equipped; for no such clay is mixed with the teachings there. After all, the chapter, in this volume, on "What is the standard of Calvinism? and what is the doctrine on this subject of the Westminster Confession, and Catechism?" interests us deeply, and with many other portions of the volume, is of much value. We think they must have a special interest for, and a lively effect on New School Presbyterians.

2.—*A Journey in Brazil.* By Professor and Mrs. LOUIS AGASSIZ.
Boston: Ticknor & Fields. pp. 540. 1868.

Mrs. AGASSIZ seems to have kept the Journal well and woven the scientific investigations of this grand expedition into a charming story which will do much toward popularizing a knowledge of the physical features, the mountains and rivers, the animals and plants of this newly opened tropical country. The reader of this book will soon discover that our great naturalist is working out original and broad problems. He is not following in old paths. He is not satisfied with the aim of Humboldt, Cuvier, Lavoisier and La Place, which was discovery. In the days when little was known of animals and plants the great object necessarily was the finding of new species. Now the great work is the questioning of fundamental relations; but of the important discoveries of the past, says Prof. Agassiz, in one of his lectures to his associates on shipboard:

"There looms up a deeper question for scientific men, the solution of which is to be the most important result of their work in coming generations. The origin of life is the great question of the day. How did the organic world come to be as it is? It must be our aim to throw some light on this subject by our present journey. How did Brazil come to be inhabited by the animals and plants now living there? Who were its inhabitants in past times?"

The party turned their attention largely to the collection of eggs and embryos and the study of the young, as having an important bearing on the question of origin. He has found that all animals of the same class are very much alike in their earlier stages of growth, and yet no germ ever grows to be different from its parent nor diverges from the pattern imposed upon it at its birth.

Mrs. Agassiz, woman-like, seems to have been even more interested in the people and their habits of life than in the more scientific objects of the expedition. She gives us various lively and interesting descriptions of the native men and women of the country, and several of the wood engravings strikingly assist the descriptions. She even waltzed to show them in turn how dancing in our country is done. Many of the cuts represent the beautiful palm trees which add so much to the picturesque of the country. Mr. Nathaniel Thayer deserves great credit for the appreciation and continuous generosity which made the expedition so complete a success and has connected his name permanently with an interesting advance in natural science. Messrs. Ticknor & Fields have brought out the volume in a very attractive dress.

3.—*The Book of Worship. Psalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, with Music.* By LEONARD WOOLSEY BACON.

THE issue of a new Hymn and Tune Book has become so common an event as scarcely to attract notice. The time has been, and that not long ago, when you could have counted all the Hymn and Tune Books in use upon your fingers; but now their name is "legion." Among so many, it has become exceedingly difficult to select that which, on the whole, is best suited for "the service of song in the house of the Lord." All have their excellencies. All have their defects. Each one perhaps is superior to any and every other in some respects. A perfect Hymn Book has not been produced and is not likely to be at present. Such a book can be expected only when a perfect Christian experience has voiced itself in song.

Among the more recent issues, with as many excellencies and as few defects, perhaps, as any, is that named at the head of this article. The publishers of the Book of Worship claim for it the following distinctive features: 1. Moderate size. 2. Typographical beauty. 3. Felicity of arrangement. 4. Variety of adaptation. 5. Freedom from vexatious alterations, both in hymns and tunes. 6. Completeness. 7. Cheapness. And if any one will give the book a thorough and candid examination, we are inclined to think he will endorse the claim.

The book is divided into Psalms and Hymns and Spiritual Songs though all are reckoned and numbered as Hymns, so that no difficulty is experienced in announcing or finding any particular hymn. The distinction between psalms and hymns, once so strenuously insisted on, has become obsolete, and might as well perhaps be laid aside. No importance is attached to it in the present collection. It is used simply as a matter of taste and convenience. Some hymns are more true to the spirit of the Book of Psalms, than many psalms so called. The Psalms in this collection are selections from the metrical version of the Psalms of David, chiefly by Watts; those only being retained which the church has adopted, and which have come into actual use. They number one hundred and three, and are chiefly psalms of adoration and praise, most suitable for the commencement of church service. The hymns, which are judiciously selected and well arranged, cover the whole ground of Christ's redemptive work, with other collateral subjects; and are sufficiently varied to suit any occasion of public worship. The Spiritual Songs, a new and striking feature of the book, embrace those metrical compositions which are now generally used in prayer meetings and in the Sabbath School; songs which the people

love to sing and will sing, especially in seasons of revival, though they have not many of them as yet found a place in our church manuals. The book is thus most admirably adapted to all the purposes for which a book of worship is wanted, and, what is a great advantage, the same book can be used in the church assembly, in the Sabbath School, and in the conference meeting.

We have thus far spoken of the Book of Worship as a Hymn Book simply. In this respect we think it not inferior *practically* to any that has recently been issued, though it contains only about half as many hymns as the Sabbath Hymn Book, Songs for the Sanctuary, Church Psalmody, the Psalmist, Psalms and Hymns, and other collections now in use. But the chief excellence of the Book of Worship is, in our judgment, the combination of hymns and tunes: the perfect adaptation of each hymn to its appropriate tune. This has been done with rare musical skill and taste on the part of the compiler, by a mechanical arrangement which has not heretofore been adopted. The tune is printed at the head of each hymn, and if the leaf is turned in singing any hymn, the tune is repeated at the top of the page, so that the singer has always both hymn and tune on the open page before him. The *special* advantage of this arrangement is that each hymn can be set to the one tune to which it is best adapted. Of course many of the most familiar and best tunes, are several times repeated in the book. The aim of the compiler seems to have been, without indulging any idiosyncrasy of his own, to connect each hymn with the tune to which it has already been wedded in the usage of the church. Thus we have at last, what has been so long waited for, a hymn and tune book, in which the old familiar hymns are joined to the old familiar tunes, as is certainly most befitting. The Book of Worship is preëminently adapted to congregational singing. In this particular, we know no book to be compared with it. Congregations can sing at once from it, and continue to sing from it. If any church is considering the subject of introducing congregational singing, we say send for the Book of Worship, and the experiment, if tried, can hardly fail to succeed.

To sum up all in one word, the Book of Worship is a *live* book. It has less dead wood in it than any Hymn and Tune Book we have ever seen. There is scarcely a hymn and tune in it that can not be used, and would not probably be used in the course of time. It is not a book to keep on the shelf, or lay upon the table, as a collection of sacred poetry from which to cull elegant extracts, to quote in sermons, or to commit to memory; but a book to sing from, in the sanc-

tuary, in the lecture room, at the family altar, and in the Sabbath School; a book of worship as it is most happily called. We rejoice that it has been published. We shall be glad to see it introduced, when the way is open for it, into our churches. It will do much, wherever it is introduced, to educate the people in the service of song and so prepare the way for the good time coming, when the words of the Psalmist shall be something more than prophecy, "Let the people praise thee, Oh God, let *all* the people praise thee."

- 4.—*On Both Sides of the Sea: A Story of the Commonwealth and the Restoration.* A Sequel to the Draytons and the Davenants. By the Author of "Chronicles of the Schonberg-Cotta Family." New York: M. W. Dodd. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. pp. 510.

THIS is probably the most interesting and profitable of all the religious stories of this very gifted writer. The subject is well chosen for these times. Beginning with Oliver's recollections on that fatal morning, January 30, 1649, we have all the great men and stirring events of that remarkable period of English history brought forward as on a stage. Mr. Dodd's edition is the only American one that has the author's sanction.

- 5.—*College Life; Its Theory and Practice.* By REV. STEPHEN OLIN, D.D., LL.D., late President of the Wesleyan University. New York: Harper & Brothers.

HERE are seven Lectures and four Baccalaureate discourses which were addressed to young men by one of the ablest and most popular of our college Presidents. These mature and comprehensive views in relation to mental and moral culture, deserve the careful consideration of all undergraduates and every body else.

- 6.—*Heavenward — Earthward.* By HARRIET B. MCKEEVER. Philadelphia: J. C. Garrigues & Co. For sale by Mass. S. S. Society, Boston. pp. 369.

THIS is an attractive view of a Christian home, drawn to life, for youth. Its reading can not fail to profit.

- 7.—*A Parting Word.* By NEWMAN HALL. New York: Sheldon & Company. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. pp. 88.

THE "Introduction" addresses this volume "To those whom I have had the privilege of addressing in America on the great truths of the

Gospel, but who have not decided to yield their hearts at once to the Saviour." The object is to impress the importance of "*now*," on the heart of the unsaved. It is done with copious and impassioned reasoning and is just the thing to present to many persons.

8.—*The Door without a Knocker.* pp. 235.

The Boy's Victory. pp. 189.

THESE two beautiful books are reprints from English works by Henry Hoyt, 9 Cornhill, Boston. The first shows up the meanness and misery of a selfish soul and life and in contrast with the beauty and usefulness of goodness. The second is just the book for boys to read who need to be taught the superiority and final advantage of truthfulness and honor. Mr. Hoyt is publishing many excellent books for children and youth.

9.—*The Little Fox: or the Story of Captain Sir F. L. M. Clintock's Arctic Expedition.* pp. 198. New York: M. W. Dodd. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.

A BEAUTIFUL and entertaining book in large type and well adapted to children, as it tells about dogs, foxes, reindeer, etc., the novel things to be seen among the Laplanders.

10.—*The Two Wallets.*

* *The Book of Remembrance; an Allegory.*

Shining Light: A book for Young Christians.

The Pet Lamb and Lambs of the Flock.

The Bird and the Arrow, with the Boy that did not like Work, etc.

The Shannons: or from Darkness to Light. pp. 336.

THESE are all published by the Presbyterian Publication Committee, Philadelphia. They are excellent books for the young and several of them of unusual interest and importance. A letter addressed to the Committee will bring them promptly by mail, prepaid.

ARTICLE X.

THE ROUND TABLE.

"THE DEVIL'S BAIT ON THE LORD'S HOOK." So an Iowa Temperance Journal characterizes Mr. Beecher's proposition to the Brooklyn Christian Association, to introduce bowling alleys and billiard tables into their new building. It is pronounced "an attempt to fish for men with the Lord's hook baited with the devil's worms, no warrant for which can be found in the example of the fisherman of Galilee." The question is well put whether Paul, with his views of "offending" others, would place such stumbling blocks as billiard tables and bowling alleys in the way of his weaker brethren, just to accommodate a few fast young men? The Temperance editor proposes instead, with excellent pertinency, "extensive woodsheds, well supplied with good dry wood, sharp axes, and well-filed saws! Let us have work-shops with chests of tools, carpenter's benches, and every facility for the development of mechanical ingenuity."

"Mr. Beecher very ingeniously says he 'dont know why the devil should own exercise any more than he does music.' It strikes us that there is just a little unfairness in this way of putting it. For there are various kinds of exercise, and some of them, even Mr. Beecher would admit, are unquestionably and incorrigibly devilish. Woman-whipping is 'exercise'; and prize-fighting is 'exercise,' most decidedly. Such exercises as these certainly belong to the devil. We conclude then that Mr. Beecher meant amusements such as billiard and ball playing. Admitting that the devil has no rightful ownership in these amusements, they are not worth the trouble and expense of an attempt to rescue them from his control."

The Western editor is evidently sharper than the Brooklyn orator. It is about time this loose and inconsequential talk were ruled out of intelligent and sensible, not to say Christian, circles. The question between those who argue for the Christianization of certain amusements and those who object, is not the question of any amusements, but of what. It is a very cunning dodge, when some recreations are opposed, to cry out, "So you are opposed to all recreations"! but it is a very shallow and transparent one. The question is not whether the devil shall have those forms of amusement which are domiciliated among Christians, but whether he shall keep those which can not safely be domiciliated. In a word it is not the question of amusements on the whole, but the narrower question of certain objectionable

ones, as such. The advocates of these will never succeed as long as they avoid the very point to be made out, viz., that these particular ones are not objectionable. They betray a mournful lack of argument, and attempt, instead, to carry the question by outcry. They need a little elementary instruction about avoiding ambiguity and "distributing the middle term" in logic. The question stated logically is something like this.

1. The church ought to rescue from the devil some amusements, (*e. g.*, those whose influence, tendencies, and associations can be cleansed, made harmless, and congruous with religion).

2. Billiards and bowling alleys are some amusements, (*e. g.*, those which can not be so purified, *i. e.*,—other ones).

3. Therefore the church should adopt them !

On this style of reasoning it might be proved that the devil himself should be received into the church.

It is no answer to say, "there are good Christians who use billiards and bowling alleys, therefore they are harmless." For it is very easy to show that their using them sanctions and increases their pernicious influence. It might just as well be pretended that the dramatization of "Norwood" proves that our theatres are morally harmless.

CONJECTURAL. Aristarchus begs a place in your Round Table. He has, in his own estimation, exercised his skill in conjectural criticism so successfully that he may be justified in making his powers known. He will give you a few specimens. The readers of Shakespeare have been perplexed to make sense of a sentence in the second scene of the first act of *The Tempest*, where Prospero describes to his daughter the perfidy of his brother :

"He being thus lorded,
Not only with what my revenue yielded,
But what my power might else exact,—like one,
Who having, unto truth, by telling of it,
Made such a sinner of his memory,
To credit his own lie."

Every one sees that it is impossible to make sense of a man's "making a sinner of his memory unto truth, by telling of it" and by this method come to "credit his own lie." The passage needs only the change of a single letter, by turning the t into an s in the word "telling," the passage will then read thus :

"Like one
Who having, unto truth, by selling of it
Made such a sinner of his memory
To credit his own lie," etc.

When a man tells a lie, he may be said to exchange the truth for a lie, which is a kind of selling of the truth, and that is very much calculated to make "a sinner of his memory"; so the passage appears to Aristarchus plain.

Let him try his strength upon another passage in Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Book III, line 344.

"No sooner had th' Almighty ceas'd; but all
The multitude of Angels with a shout,
Loud as from numbers without number, sweet
As from bless'd voices, uttering joy: Heav'n rung
With Jubilee, and loud Hosannas filled
Th' eternal Regions":

The great difficulty here is in parsing this passage. How is the grammar to be made out? An affirmative verb seems to be wanting. Dr. Bentley, who is a disciple of Aristarchus, says in one of his notes: "Here's a sentence without a verb. No doubt the author gave it

"The multitude of angels *gave* a shout."

But this is too bold and entirely unnecessary. No doubt the author meant to imitate certain elliptical examples found in the classic poets. In Neptune's speech to the winds and waves, in the first book of the *Æneid*, 132d line, we have this example:

Tantane vos generis tenuit fiducia vestri?
Jam cælum terramque meo sine numine, venti,
Miscere, et tantas audetis tollere moles?
Quos ego. Sed motos præstat componere fluctus.

And we have a very similar example in Juno's speech a few lines previous. The leaving out of the finite verb was intentional and was, in the author's view, exquisitely epic. The only fault in our common editions is in the pointing, which should be thus:

Quos ego—Sed motos præstat componere fluctus.

Macrobius on this line gives a parallel example from Demosthenes. See *Saturnalia*, Book VI, chap. 6.

Aristarchus will give one example more from the sacred Book. In the epistle of James, chap. iii. v. 6. we have this sentence: And the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity; in the original:—καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ, ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας. This has puzzled some; it has been translated—*abundance of iniquity*, as is the meaning of our common translation; *the ornament of iniquity*, which is the first meaning of the word κόσμος. But it is not uncommon for the sacred writers to put the predicate of a proposition in the genitive, as in II. Corinthians ii. 3, "my joy is *the joy of you all*," or, leaving out the

italics, "my joy is—of you all." So in this passage. "The tongue is a fire; the world is—of iniquity," *i. e.*, a world of iniquity, or, still better, repeat the noun of the last sentence—*βλῆ*—"The tongue is a fire, *ὁ κόσμος ἐστὶ βλῆ τῆς ἀδικίας*; *i. e.*, the tongue is a fire and the world is made up of wicked combustibles; so is the tongue among our members, that it defileth the whole body and setteth on fire the course of nature; and is set on fire of hell. This is all consecutive and natural. In all the cases quoted in Wetstein's Testament, "*βλῆ*" means fuel; burnable matter.

Aristarchus, having given these specimens of his conjectural powers, proceeds to a more difficult work; not an ancient manuscript; not a lost line from Homer; not an inscrutable construction in Isaiah, or Job, but, The Four Rings of the Ark, published in the last number of *The Congregational Review*. There are one or two sentences that puzzle even Aristarchus himself. But, as blind writing is the rage and madness of this generation, we venture to read Shittimwood on page 176 in the last line but three. In page 181, in the first line of the quotation from Dr. Thomson's "The Land and the Book," instead of "Sheikh Fareig" read "Sheikh Fareij." In page 182, for "Father Paul Sarpir" read "Father Paul Sarpi." We then come to a line which Aristarchus confesses he can not understand. In page 184, is this sentence: "We find ourselves on our advancement." As this line seems to lack meaning, and not to agree with the context, he would propose to exchange the word *find* for *pride*. "We pride ourselves on our advancement." In the last sentence in the piece, it reads, "I tell this story to make the Bible credible, and to make the charity of the psuedo-millennial day a certain hope." As this sentiment makes a contributor to an Orthodox journal a heretic as to the millennium Aristarchus would substitute for "psuedo," "paulo-post-millennial day." Both readings he confesses are somewhat harsh, but he is sure he does not understand the one, and is not wholly sure that he understands the other; but he supposes it to mean "the *soon-coming* millennium." In the note there are two inconsistent readings. First, "it occurred in Dorchester a little more than eighty years ago." As this is inconsistent with what is said in the previous page, Aristarchus would substitute *less* for *more*. If the boy was twelve years old when he saw the auction and that took place more than eighty years ago, he must be a very superannuated witness of a very incredible event. Nobody will believe it. In the second line after, instead of *two* Corinthian columns read *four*, for the house was cut open in the middle and two would not have supported the roof.

PRESBYTERIANISM YIELDING. Is it possible that some of us will live to see a grand union of the Presbyterians and Congregationalists in this country? And why will not those divisions which are not doctrinal be the first to give way when we come to reap the harvest of our present union seed-sowing? The *American Presbyterian and Theological Review* for April contains, with other excellent papers, an admirable article from Dr. Roswell D. Hitchcock, one of its associate editors, in which Presbyterianism is shown to be undergoing the process of reduction and simplification, and bids fair to come a long way over to the open ground of Congregationalism. The article is a review of the work of Dr. P. C. Campbell on Ruling Eldership, in which the theory of Calvin, of two kinds of Presbyters, is given up as no longer tenable. We quote a few paragraphs of what Dr. Hitchcock says, in this influential *Review*, as another evidence of the dawn of better days.

"The drift of critical opinion is now decidedly in this direction. It is beginning to be conceded, even among Presbyterians of the staunchest sort, that Calvin was mistaken in his interpretation of 1 Tim. v. 17; that two orders of Presbyters are not there brought to view, but only one order; the difference referred to being simply that of service, and not of rank. And if this famous passage fails to justify the *Dual Presbyterate*, much less may we rely upon the *ὁ προϊστάμενος, ἐν σπουδῇ*, 'he that ruleth with diligence,' of Romans xii. 8, or the *κυβερνήσεις*, 'governments,' of 1 Cor. xii. 28. In short, the *Jure Divino* theory of the Lay Eldership is steadily losing ground. A better support is sought for it in the New Testament recognition throughout of the right and propriety of lay participation in Church government; in the general right of the Church, as set forth by Hooker in his Ecclesiastical Polity, to govern itself by whatsoever forms it pleases."

"As Presbyterians it is high time for us to drop this *Jure Divino* business altogether. *Jure Divino* Presbyterianism is no better than *Jure Divino* Episopacy, or *Jure Divino* Congregationalism, except in so far as the polity itself is better."

"It is only our strictly Lay Eldership which is comparatively new and strange, though this novelty is more of form than of substance. We might easily be rid of it any day by ordaining our Lay Elders, and making them ministers of the word and dispensers of the sacraments."

THE LAST OF AUTUMN.

BY P. L.

I LOVE the autumn, yet can hardly tell why;
The flowers have faded, the leaves become dry;
'Tis silent around us — there's no humming bees;
There's no singing birds on the boughs of the trees;
No chirp of the cricket, he's gone to his hole;
The geese only hiss as they fly from the cold.
The turkey close folds her smooth wings and cries quit;
Proclaiming our thanks, makes her think of the spit.
The little red squirrel, in search of his food,
Looks to left and to right, then crosses the road;
Quick picks up a shellbark — the best nut of all, —
Recrosses the road, and runs into the wall.
Last night the aurora was shooting on high,
The stars were seen winking all over the sky.
What! there's snow flakes now flying on the cold blast:
'Tis no longer autumn, 'tis winter at last!
Sad this would make us had we never before
Seen frost on the window and snow at the door,
And never heard the wind sigh in the wainscot —
(This sighing, when once heard is never forgot).
Yes, in faith we believe that life lies beneath,
That there's pure air in heaven which millions will breathe.
Now this gives the key to our love for the time
That so much reminds us of man past his prime.
We know that the frost and the snow times before
Have covered the rivers, and mountains, and moor,
As though Nature, tired, had lain down to rest,
While the sun made daily short trips to the west,
And looks on the world as if it were sleeping,
And knew the good that from rest it was reaping.
All well remember what has often been said
Of the mother watching her infant in bed;
That she takes to herself some suitable place,
Where her eye can rest on its innocent face,
(Tis no superstition, this kind law of love,
But like all pure affections comes from above) —
The child feels this influence, wakes up and smiles:
And so shall the world be of slumber beguiled:
Flowers shall again bloom, leaves wave in the wind,
And nature say, smiling, Our Father is kind.